

Department of City and Regional Planning

PLAN 770 Economic Development Policy

Spring 2019
Time: T/TH 2 - 3:15pm
Room: Hanes Art Center 116
Office hours: by appointment

Prof. Nichola Lowe
Office: 303 New East
nlowe@email.unc.edu
Tel: 843-2319

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Economic development is much more than the high-profile fight over Amazon HQ2, or other notable recruitment deals that cost tax-payers millions of dollars in questionable corporate subsidies and incentives. Economic development planning can enhance local business formation, promote inclusive innovation and advance job quality standards and environmentally-friendly outcomes. What matters is not the specific tools that are in play, but rather how they are implemented and combined to extend economic opportunity and promote broadly-shared prosperity.

This seminar is open to graduate and advanced undergraduate students. It provides an overview of common and emergent economic development strategies, helping students understand what works well, why and in what context. Course readings, class discussions and exchanges with local practitioners provide a general overview of specific tools and strategies and expose students to emergent and established debates about their use and implementation. Case study analysis enables students to hone their qualitative research and analytical writing skills. The ultimate goal of this course is for students to think critically about both merits and limits of individual economic development strategies, yet also understand the particular conditions that enable certain cities, regions and communities to guide and coordinate strategy use in innovative and more equitable ways.

No economics background is required. Students in other planning specializations are encouraged to join the class and can choose to work on case study topics that explore the intersection of their planning specialization and economic development.

COURSE FORMAT

The course operates in a structured seminar format. The first weeks of the course will briefly introduce students to the field of economic development and its intellectual roots and traditions. This course, however, is not designed to provide an in-depth review of foundational economic development theories. Students are therefore encouraged to take a dedicated economic development theory course, such as PLAN 773 Regional Development Seminar, in order to round out their understanding of underlying theoretical influences in this field.

Most of our time in this course will focus on a set of economic development strategies commonly pursued in the field, using a combination of guided classroom discussion of assigned readings, in-class activities and in-depth student presentations of case study material. Case studies will enable students to consider the particular context, as well as specific challenges, to strategy implementation. In addition, this case study component will be structured to encourage students to hone their skills in case study research design, writing and analysis.

A maximum level of active participation by students is *required*. Please read the assigned material and come prepared to contribute to class discussion.

READING

Readings for the course consist of a set of required readings from a wide range of books, journals, newspaper articles and professional reports. The readings for each class are provided in the course calendar below. All required readings that do not have listed **URL links** are posted on **Sakai**.

FEEDBACK PARTNER

I will assign you a feedback partner for the entire semester who will be a resource for early feedback on case study development. You will not be graded on your use of this partnership, though thoughtful feedback from a partner is likely to reflect in your final case study grade. You should view this as a resource and relationship that you can tap for this class and possibly others throughout your academic career. You should schedule time to meet with or interact with (by email or phone) this person outside of normal class hours. Also be prepared to share a copy of your claim/supporting evidence reflection paper with your partner, as well as an early case study draft.

In addition to peer feedback, I would strongly encourage you to take advantage of the resources provided by the UNC writing center. This is not just for ESL or undergraduate students, but offers resources for native English speaking graduate students as well. Information on the UNC writing center services is available at: <http://writingcenter.unc.edu/>

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

SUBMIT ALL WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS IN ELECTRONIC, MS WORD FORMAT TO NLOWE@EMAIL.UNC.EDU

Class Participation (20 percent total: 5 percent attendance + 15 percent in-class participation): Each session is more effective as a dialogue rather than lecture. Please complete all assigned readings before class and be prepared to contribute. I will reduce attendance grades for students who miss class without notifying me in advance.

Analytical case study (80 percent total; see breakdown below): Most of your time this semester will be spent researching, writing and editing an analytical case study of an applied strategy or economic development challenge. The end result will be a polished 15-18 page (double spaced, 12 point font) case study due at the end of the semester (due at start of class on **Thursday April 18th**). [Co-authored reports should be 25-28 pages]. Each case study should be an example of a strategy or challenge reviewed in class that has been adopted/targeted by a city, county or state/quasi-state economic development agency or partnership.

The case study is meant to illustrate and illuminate local challenges to strategy implementation, and the steps taken by actors or organizations involved to resolve or mitigate these challenges. *This is not meant to be a structured program evaluation*, but rather is meant to draw out what is innovative, unique or challenging to strategy implementation within a specific context or institutional setting. You may also consider writing a case study that looks closely at a failed attempt at strategy implementation; or a missed opportunity for strategic intervention. In this case, the goal would be to identify the factors that have undermined strategy success or intervention in that particular institutional setting.

I will work with you to identify an appropriate case study topic. Additionally, we will have an opportunity to work with Carolyn Fryberger (MCRP '14) this semester. You will have the option to format your case study for a new on-line resource, Homegrown Tools for Economic Development, that Carolyn and others at NC Growth/Kenan Institute have created for economic development practitioners and researchers in North Carolina.

To facilitate and guide case study development, we will review key aspects of case study writing over the course of the semester, and also look at several examples of existing explanatory/analytical cases studies that pertain to economic development policy. You will also be given time to present your working case study material in class in order to get feedback on how you are framing or analyzing the case and to determine if the evidence you provide is sufficiently detailed.

To help with case study writing, you are expected to complete the following tasks over the course of the semester:

Weekly interview commitment: In addition to reviewing secondary data sources (i.e., newspaper articles, reports, promotional materials, etc.), you are required to interview at least 7 individuals for your case study during the course of the semester. Starting the week of **Feb. 4th**, I will send out a weekly check sheet to monitor your interview progress. Do not procrastinate! It takes considerable time to set up and complete interviews—prepare for delays and last minute cancelations. Also, some of your interviewees will have suggestions for others to speak with. Getting started early in the semester will give you greater options for identifying the best interviewees for the case. *Failure to complete 7 interviews will reflect in your final case study grade.*

Interpreting the case through two interviews (10 percent): Due before class on Tuesday, Feb. 26th. For this written assignment, you will take two of your case study interviews and write a 2-3 page double spaced paper. Start by briefly telling me who you interviewed and why they were chosen. The paper should focus on the most important thing you learned from these interviews. I don't want a laundry list of everything you learned or a point-by-point summary of each interview, but rather an in-depth reflection about how the information gathered from these two interviews has helped you analyze or interpret key aspects of your case study. Stylistically I find it is better to write up your results thematically using 2 or 3 cross-cutting themes and talk about how the interviews, in combination, informed or influenced your thinking about each theme. This is preferred to a style where you simply present one interview and its core themes in its entirety followed by the other.

Claims and supporting evidence (10 percent): Due before class on Tuesday, March 19th. A strong analytical case study involves interpreting evidence in order to support, test or refine a central claim or set of nested claims. For this written exercise (2-3 double spaced pages), you will be given an opportunity to work through an arguable claim and sort through the evidence you have gathered in support of that claim or set of related claims. You must provide at least 3 forms of evidence. At least one should be a quote or paraphrased statement from an interview. After presenting each piece of evidence, explain in your own words why you think it supports or reinforces your main claim or argument. At the end of the assignment, please note any potential gaps in evidence (or counterclaims) and outline the research steps you plan to undertake to resolve them. I have added a writing resources folder on Sakai that includes on-line and published sources describing how to develop an arguable, evidence-supported claim and warrant statement.

Presentation of case study material (15 percent): You will be asked to give a 10-12 minute formal presentation on your case study (your time slot should allow time for questions and answers). You will share the class session with 3-4 other students, so use good time management. I expect you to be well-prepared (i.e., be sure to rehearse your talk! Perhaps do a practice run with your feedback partner) and to give a polished presentation on the case study material you have gathered to date. Obviously, those presenting earlier will have significantly less material to share. In this case, use the presentation time as an opportunity to talk about what you know from secondary data sources or from exploratory interviews, begin framing the case and talk about the steps you are taking to build the case study and fill in gaps. All presenters are encouraged to include a section describing any difficulties encountered with case study development, be they related to research or to writing/framing activities. The goal is to both educate your classmates on an applied strategy, but also use this presentation to get detailed feedback and guidance for your case study design and write-up.

You do not need to use PowerPoint, though some kind of visual aid is required. If you do not use PowerPoint, then plan to provide a detailed handout on the case (one sheet, two sides if necessary).

I will use a presentation evaluation form, available on Sakai, to determine your grade and provide feedback. Your feedback partner will also be asked to complete a peer evaluation form and share written, constructive comments with you on your presentation style and substance.

Interview accountability (5 points). If you plan to publish, post or publicly share your case study, you will need to request IRB approval in advance of publication or posting. **This is required for any cases that are eligible for the NC Growth webtool!** This institutional review process ensures your research does not violate human ethics standards. If you have not done so already, you will first need to complete an on-line human subject training course (see training link below). This training is required for students conducting research involving interviews, so will likely be required for another project you work on in the future, such as your master's project or a thesis. You only need to complete the training once while at UNC. Prior to submitting an IRB application on-line, you should create a basic consent form (samples are available through the IRB website, though you can customize your own); an interview guide (aim for 10-12 motivating questions); an introductory script (a few paragraphs which you will read or email to potential interviewees when you first establish contact). Allow at least 2 weeks for approval and expect at least one round of minor revisions. I would recommend submitting your IRB application by mid-February at the latest to ensure timing review. If there are no anticipated risks for interviewees, you may submit an IRB application requesting an exemption.

Training: <https://www.citiprogram.org/>

On-line IRB submission: <http://research.unc.edu/offices/human-research-ethics/online-submission/index.htm>

*Regardless of whether you plan to make your case public, I ask that you also send all interviewees any quotes or paraphrased statements you wish to include in your case study. You do not need to send them your full case study draft for review, but rather send ONLY the relevant sections where their quotes or interviews are referenced. Please give them at least one week to review the material and note any factual errors or corrections. **Please blind copy me on your emails so I can credit you (5) points towards your final grade.***

Final case study (40 percent): A first full draft of your case study must be shared with your feedback partner by the start of class on **Thursday April 4th**. They have one week to read the

document and provide you with written suggestions/feedback. A complete case, final version of your case study is due to me by the start of class on **Thursday April 18th**. Please print out a hard copy and also send me an electronic version in MS Word format.

POLICY FOR LATE ASSIGNMENTS: Please note that I will downgrade assignments a half letter grade for each late day. Exceptions will be made in the case of a medical or family emergency. Please try to notify me in advance if you require an approved extension.

PLAN 770 COURSE TOPICS AND REQUIRED READING

Course Overview (Jan 10)

Defining Economic Growth and Development (Jan 15)

Malizia, E. E. 1994. "A redefinition of economic development." *Economic Development Review*, Spring, pp. 83-4.

Fitzgerald, Joan and Nancey Green Leigh. 2002. *Economic Revitalization: Cases and Strategies for City and Suburb*. Chapter 1: Redefining the Field of Local Economic Development. Page 26-33. Sage Publications.

Pick one of the following:

Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Chapter 1. New York: First Anchor Books.

http://ocean.otr.usm.edu/~w301497/teaching/documents_teaching/Sen_1999_DevelopmentAsFreedomIntro+ch1.pdf

Kallis, Giorgos, Federico Demaria and Giacomo D'Alisa (eds). *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era*. 2014. **Introduction** by Giorgos Kallis, Federico Demaria and Giacomo D'Alisa. Routledge. (note, this link is for the entire book) https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Diego_Andreucci/publication/311871937_Capitalism/links/585e766e08ae6eb871a315f9.pdf

State and Local Economic Development: An Evolving Field (Jan 17)

Glasmeyer, A. K. 2000. "Economic geography in practice: Local economic development policy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography*, edited by G. L. Clark, M. P. Feldman, and M. S. Gertler, pp. 559-79. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ross, Doug and Robert E. Friedman. 1990. "The Emerging Third Wave: New Economic Development Strategies in the '90s." *The Entrepreneurial Economy Review*. Vol. 9. No. 1. Pp. 3-10.

Lowe, Nichola and Maryann Feldman. Selection from: 2018. *Breaking the Waves: Innovation at the Intersection of Economic Development Policy*. *Economic Development Quarterly*.

(optional) Hanley, Caroline, and Michael T. Douglass. 2014. "High road, low road, or off road? Economic development strategies in the American states." *Economic Development Quarterly* 28.3: 220-229.

Case Studies for "Homegrown Tools": Carolyn Fryberger (Jan 22)

Review site and cases: Homegrown Tools for Economic Development

State and Local Economic Development: An Evolving Field Continued (Jan 24)

International Economic Development Council. Economic Development Reference Guide.

http://www.iedconline.org/clientuploads/Downloads/IEDC_ED_Reference_Guide.pdf

North Carolina's Changing Economic Development Landscape: Panel discussion with Jesse White, Allan Freyer and Josh Levy (Jan 29)

Carlisle, Rich. 2010. An Overview of Economic Development Policy in North Carolina: Transforming the State from Poverty to Prosperity.

<https://iei.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Carlisle-Economic-Development-Policy-edit.pdf>

Freyer, Allan. 2013. Getting it Right - Three accountability challenges in Gov. McCrory's proposal for partially privatizing the Department of Commerce

<http://www.ncjustice.org/?q=budget-and-tax/btc-reports-getting-it-right-three-accountability-challenges-gov-mccrorys-proposal>

Lester, T. William and Nichola Lowe. 2015. Rebuilding the Bridge to the Future: An Analysis of What Works for North Carolina's Economy. ThinkNCFirst.

<http://www.thinkncfirst.org/research/rebuilding-the-bridge-to-the-future-an-analysis-of-what-works-for-north-carolinas-economy>

Interviewing Techniques: Sophie Kelmenson & Andy Guinn (Jan 31)

William Foote Whyte. 1984. Learning from the Field: A Guide from Experience. Chapter 6, Interviewing Strategy.

Gregory Andranovich and Gerry Riposa. 1993. Doing Urban Research. Page 74-85, Primary Data.

John Lofland and Lyn Lofland. 1995. Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. Chapter 3, Getting In.

(optional) Piore, Michael. 2006. Qualitative Research: Does it Fit in Economics? In, A Handbook for Social Science Field Research.

<http://economics.mit.edu/files/1125>

Business Recruitment (Feb 5)

Lowe, Nichola. 2014. Selection from: Beyond the Deal: Using Industrial Recruitment as a Strategic Tool for Manufacturing Development. *Economic Development Quarterly*.

Lowe, Nichola and Maryann Feldman. Selection from: 2018. Breaking the Waves: Innovation at the Intersection of Economic Development Policy. *Economic*

Development Quarterly.

Business Incentive Deals (Feb 7)

Dean, Amy. 2012. We Want Our Money Back. The American Prospect. March 7. <http://prospect.org/article/we-want-our-money-back>

Weber, Rachel. 2002. Do Better Contracts Make Better Economic Development Incentives? *Journal of the American Planning Association.* 68:1, 43-55.

Bartik, Timothy J. 2005. "Solving the Problems of Economic Development Incentives." *Growth and Change* 36 (2) 139-166.

Lowe, Nichola, T. William Lester and Mary Donegan. 2018. Does doling out economic incentives create jobs? A UNC study says no. News and Observer. <https://www.newsobserver.com/opinion/article223205485.html>

Case Study: Deconstruction Exercise (Evidence and Claims) (Feb 12)

Read over the 3 handouts in the Writing Claims with Evidence (Case Study) subfolder in Sakai

McLaurin, Glenn. Case Study: The First Decade of Development of North Carolina's Global TransPark and the Regional Partnership of Eastern North Carolina.

Inner-City Investment: Lessons from Enterprise Zones (Feb 14)

Porter, M. E. 1997. New strategies for inner-city economic development. *Economic Development Quarterly* 11: 11-27.

Harrison, Bennett and Amy Glasmeier. 1997. Response: Why Business Alone Won't Redevelop the inner-city: A friendly critique of Michael Porter's approach to urban revitalization. *Economic Development Quarterly* 11: 28.

MG Wilder, BM Rubin. 1996. Rhetoric versus Reality: A Review of Studies on State Enterprise Zone Programs. *Journal of the American Planning Association*

Harnessing the Capital From Opportunity Zones Toward Equitable Development Goal. Melissa Roark, with Alexandra Sirota. NC Justice Center. November 2018. <https://www.ncjustice.org/sites/default/files/BTC%20report%20-%20opportunity%20zones.pdf>

Industrial Cluster Development (Feb 19)

Porter, Michael. 2000. Location, Competition, and Economic Development: Local Clusters in a Global Economy. *Economic Development Quarterly.*

Barzelay, Michael. 1991. "Managing Local Development: Lessons from Spain." *Policy Sciences*. Vol. 24. Pp. 271-90.

Lowe, Nichola. 2009. Challenging Tradition: Unlocking New Paths to Regional Industrial Upgrading. *Environment and Planning A*. 41(1): 128-145

Case study deconstruction II: (Intro and Implications) (Feb 21)

McLaurin, Glenn. Case Study: The First Decade of Development of North Carolina's Global TransPark and the Regional Partnership of Eastern North Carolina.

Wayne Booth, Gregory Colomb and Joseph Williams. 1995. The Craft of Research. Page 160-166; Page 234-249.

Alan Thomas and Giles Mohan. 2007. Research Skills for Policy and Development. Page 325-329.

Student Presentations #1 (Feb 26) [interview assignment due]

Guest Speaker: TBA (Feb 28)

Preserving Industrial Land (Mar 5)

Fitzgerald and Nancey Green Leigh. 2002. "Industrial Retention: Multiple Strategies for Keeping Manufacturing Strong."

Molina, Joshua. 2007. San Jose Wrestles with Rezoning of Industrial Land for Housing: Turning Industrial Land into Housing Can Hurt Tax Base.

Lester, T.W. and Kaza, N. and Kirk, S., Making Room for Manufacturing: Understanding Industrial Land Conversion in Cities – *Journal of American Planning Association* 79(4):295-313
http://sia.planning.unc.edu/uploads/publications/japa_all.pdf

Student Presentations #2 (Mar 7)

SPRING BREAK

Student Presentations #3 (Mar 19) [claims/evidence assignment due]

Manufacturing Extension and Small Business Upgrading (Mar 21)

Shapira, P. 2001. US manufacturing extension partnerships: technology policy reinvented? *Research Policy*. Vol. 30. No. 6.

Matt Schuneman. 2012. Who Helps the Helpers? Examining the Challenging Environment for US Manufacturing Support Services via a Case Study of the Industrial Extension Service. EDP Case Study.

Philipp Brandt, Andrew Schrank, and Josh Whitford. 2018. Brokerage and Boots on the Ground: Complements or Substitutes in the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships? *Economic Development Quarterly*.

(Optional: Tendler, Judith. Small Firms, the Informal Sector and the Devil's Deal. <http://www1.oecd.org/gov/regionaldevelopment/2489858.pdf>)

Student Presentations #4 (Mar 26)

Student Presentations #5 OR Case Study Workshop (Mar 28)

REMINDER: SHARE CASE STUDY DRAFT WITH PARTNER ON APRIL 4th

Innovation Districts (Apr 3)

Katz, Bruce and Julie Wagner. 2014. The Rise of Innovation Districts: A New Geography of Innovation in America. Brookings Institute. <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Programs/metro/Images/Innovation/InnovationDistricts1.pdf>

(update): <https://www.brookings.edu/research/one-year-after-observations-on-the-rise-of-innovation-districts/>

Drucker, Joshua and Amanda Kass. 2015. Innovation Districts: Economic Development Innovation or Shiny New Bottle? Working Paper.

Maher, Amanda. Can Neighborhood Innovation Districts Spur Sustainable Economic Growth in Boston? ICIC Blog. <http://icic.org/can-neighborhood/>

Lazonick, B. & Mazzucato M. 2013. "The risk-reward nexus in the innovation-inequality relationship: who takes the risks? Who gets the rewards?" *Industrial and Corporate Change* 22(4):1093–1128.

Tour: Downtown Durham Innovation Spaces (Apr 5, Friday)

American Underground: A Startup Incubator in Durham, North Carolina. Thriving Cities. Case Study. <http://thrivingcities.com/au-case-study>

[Lowe, Nichola. 2017. Lessons from the American Underground. Planning Magazine \(APA\). December. http://nicholalowe.web.unc.edu/files/2015/06/AU_Lowe.pdf](http://nicholalowe.web.unc.edu/files/2015/06/AU_Lowe.pdf)

White, Gillian. 2016. The Downside of Durham's Rebirth. <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/03/the-downside-of-durhams-rebirth/476277/>

Makers: A New Industrial Revolution? (Apr 9) (Location: BEAM UNC)

Anderson, Chris. 2010. In the Next Industrial Revolution, Atoms Are the New Bits. *Wired Magazine*. January 25.

http://www.wired.com/magazine/2010/01/ff_newrevolution/all/

Rotman, David. 2013. The Difference Between Makers and Manufacturers. *Technology Review*. January 2.

<http://www.technologyreview.com/review/508821/the-difference-between-makers-and-manufacturers/>

Wolf-Powers, Laura, Schrock, Greg and Doussard, Marc. 2017. The Maker Movement and Urban Economic Development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Download link here: https://works.bepress.com/laura_wolf_powers/43/

Evgeny Morozov. 2014. Making it. *New Yorker*.

<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/01/13/making-it-2>

Lowe, Nichola, Colleen Durfee and Tara Vinodrai. 2018. Threading Together Carolina's Textile Comeback. *Angles Blog (Carolina Planning Journal)*.

<https://carolinaangles.com/2018/04/24/threading-together-carolinas-textile-manufacturing-comeback/>

Local Foods Economy (April 11)

Donald, Betsy. 2008. Food Systems Planning and Sustainable Cities and Regions: The Role of the Firm in Sustainable Food Capitalism. *Regional Studies*. Vol. 42.9 PP. 1251-1262.

Colloredo-Mansfield, Rudi, M. Tewari, J. Williams, D. Holland, A Steen. 2014. "Communities, Supermarkets, and Local Food: Mapping Connections and Obstacles in Food Systems Work in North Carolina." *Human Organization*, Vol 73, No. 3.

Rosenfeld, Stu. 2010. Sustainable Food Systems Cluster, Vermont Style. *European Planning Studies*. Vol. 18. No. 11.

Room for Debate: Making it Easier to Eat Local Foods. *New York Times*. April 2010.

<http://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/04/19/making-it-easier-to-eat-local-food/>

Arts, Culture and Design: Doreen Jacob (Apr 16)

Wojan, Timothy, Dayton Lambert and David McGranahan. 2007. "Emoting with their feet: Bohemian attraction to creative milieu." *Journal of Economic Geography*. (7):711-736.

Rosenfeld, Stuart. 2004. "Crafting a New Rural Development Strategy." *Economic Development America*. Economic Development Information Coalition. Page 11-13

Mississippi's Creative Economy Executive Summary: Realizing the Economic Potential of Creativity in Mississippi. Mississippi Development Authority. Mississippi Arts Commission.

Resilience and Recovery (Apr 18) FINAL CASE STUDY DUE!

Rodriguez-Pose, Andres. 2018. The revenge of the places that don't matter (and what to do about it). Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/85888/>

Christopherson, Susan. 2009. Manufacturing: Up from the Ashes. Democracy Journal. <http://democracyjournal.org/magazine/14/manufacturing-up-from-the-ashes/>

Allen, Mel. Oct 2018. Bucksport, Maine | The Town That Refused to Die. Yankee Magazine. <https://newengland.com/yankee-magazine/travel/maine/the-town-that-refused-to-die/>

Mahler, Jonathan. 2011. Now that the Factories are Closed, It's Tee Time in Benton Harbor, Mich. New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/18/magazine/benton-harbor.html?pagewanted=all>

Restore your economy: case studies in economic, disaster or tourism recovery
<http://restoreyoureconomy.org/resources/case-studies/>
(Pick one case to review)

Greening the Local Economy (Apr 23)

Campbell, S. 1996. "Green Cities, Growth Cities, Just Cities? Urban Planning and the Contradictions of Sustainable Development." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 62. No. 3. Pp. 296-312.

K Chapple, C Kroll, TW Lester and S. Montero. 2011. Innovation in the Green Economy: An extension of the regional innovation system model? *Economic Development Quarterly*. Vol 25. No 1. Pp. 5-25.

Rodrik, D. (2013). Green Industrial Policy. Princeton University Working Paper. Read pages 19-29 (starting with: "better rules for industrial policy".)
<https://www.sss.ias.edu/files/pdfs/Rodrik/Research/Green-growth-and-industrial-policy.pdf>

<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/05/opinion/the-conservative-case-for-solar-subsidies.html>)

Varun Sivaram, Teryn Norris, Colin McCormick, and David M. Hart. 2016 (December). Energy Innovation Policy: Priorities for the Trump Administration and Congress. ITIF. <http://www2.itif.org/2016-energy-innovation-policy.pdf>

Course Wrap-Up and Evaluation (Apr 25)