**REVIEWER A:**

An underlying question that nagged at me throughout the article relates to the test development process. There are a number of important assumptions regarding the world view supported by the OECD assessments—not the least of which is the preeminence of numeracy, literacy, and scientific knowledge, and what counts as acceptable achievement to the OECD. It would be helpful to have some discussion of the process the OECD uses for establishing the standards against which judgements related to the test scores are validated. Yes, we know the tests give us results, but how meaningful are the OECD interpretations of those results? I donʼt see this as a huge edit, but a paragraph upfront that tells us how the OECD determines the domains to be tested and establishes the standards for proficiency would be helpful. Paragraph 2 on page 10 seems to really capture this point when it counterbalances critiques of the OECDʼs neoliberal mandate and recent support of investment to create more equitable outcomes.

We have addressed the rationale for these surveys by connecting it to the notion of human capital theory and have drawn on a variety of statements made by the OECD in relation to PISA, TALIS, and PIAAC (which they suggest are linked to empirical research).

There seems to be a strong disconnect between the PISA and PIAAC results, at least in Canada. The authors highlight the numeracy scores of teachers specifically. If the results for adults are so poor, yet the results for students so high, where is the disconnect? Or—is one or the other of the assessments not producing results that are valid for the comparative use? You go on to present the more nuanced analysis of the AUCC, which is helpful. Perhaps it would be worth toning down your statement that the “most troubling finding is that the worst numeracy performers are graduates of teaching programs“. With that statement you are editorially giving credibility to results that might not warrant such support.

We have revised this statement in light of the reviewers’ suggestion.

I do take issue with one of the claims toward the end—that OECDʼs impact is exaggerated because the reforms recommended arenʼt broadly implemented. As with much policy work, I would suggest that the work of the OECD, in both research and recommendations, is being cherry-picked to support established advocacy agendas by all sides of the education policy debates. A key point missed (until a brief nod at the very end) by the authors is appropriate use of the data and recommendations. That is, popular media and advocacy organizations frequently use the semi-public data to promote an agenda that may have no real link to OECD goals.

I agree with this point and have actually published an article that affirms the above. I included a few points to also support this statement with references to additional research.

An interesting side note is related to tensions within the OECDʼs own advocacy agenda, where we see the use of indicators to rank and categorize nations (a neoliberal strategy using competition to promote excellence) and the promotion of increased investment to support equitable outcomes (a more communal objective).

All in all, this is a balanced and nuanced presentation of the educational work of the OECD. That said, while it offers a broad picture of what the OECD does, and presents that work within the context of the criticisms of that work, the author(s) ultimately lead us to a rather vanilla ending. The author(s) note at the end, “Although the education community should remain vigilant to ensure international survey results are not utilized inappropriately, these measures cannot be dismissed, nor can their results be treated as exerting a uniform impact within or across nations.”

We revised this statement accordingly.

A series of recommendations would be useful here—*how* can we “ensure international survey results are not utilized inappropriately”? Iʼd also like to see that authors shift the last part of the sentence in a more advocacy framed direction, “these measures *should not* be dismissed, nor *should* their results be treated as exerting a uniform impact within or across nations” and then provide us with advice as to what we can do to ensure the results arenʼt dismissed and are used appropriately.

We revised this entire section and also provided some suggestions (that stem from the international literature).

**REVIEWER B**

Quality of the Writing

The manuscript is well written. I found the writing to be engaging and easy to follow. The manuscript was well organized and well supported with evidence from the literature.

\*There was a reference missing from the reference list – (Klinger, et al., 2016). I didn’t comb through the reference list but I was interested in reading that paper so I looked specifically for it.

We had to mask this reference for blind review as it is a chapter in my book.

Significance of the Research Questions

This was a literature review. If you accept literature reviews, I think it is worth considering. The point of the paper was to provide information about OECD testing and to provide a balanced critique of the implications for education and for educators.

Appropriateness of the research questions

NA

Originality/Value of the contribution to Educational Administration

The topic of OECD testing and creating greater awareness of the political and practical implications of all of the global testing in education is important. It is a topic that is getting lots of attention in the public and I think CJEAP readers will care about being informed about this topic. Furthermore, even though the paper is not a formal study, I found the piece to be both interesting and informative.

Other

The main decision, in my opinion, is regarding the publication of a literature review. If you agree to accept literature reviews, then I would give this paper a thumbs up.

**REVIEWER C:**

This paper has some promise but has significant gaps that must be addressed in order to make a worthy contribution to the expansive literature on the topic of the influence of OECD policy/program on education. In the sections below, I provide some specific areas that need revision:

1. The author/s suggest/s that this paper discusses the normative influence of the OECD on the educational policy sphere. There is very little attention given to the theoretical perspective of what a normative influence is. The authors provide two sentences about typology of governance on p. 9 (about cognitive and normative governance). If this is a major argument of the paper, this concept needs to be more fully conceptualized as a meaningful way to analyze policy influence.

We have shifted the focus from normative governance to global educational governance and provide a more thorough discussion of human capital theory.

1. There are some areas where the authors make quite substantial claims without appropriately and sufficiently providing evidence from the literature to help the reader understand how the authors arrive at these claims. Here are some examples:
   1. “Thus, it should be acknowledged that in significant parts of the world – particularly the Middle East, South America, and Africa – little research or policy analysis studies have been conducted.” This statement needs some qualifying. Have the authors searched only English language publications in this area?

We have revised this statement and added a couple of additional points.

* 1. “As a result, many fear the norms, ideas, and knowledge associated with education will come to service solely the economic functions of schools. Perhaps they are unaware that OECD is not an autonomous body but a cooperation between countries, governed by the representatives of governments of the participation countries.” Who are these “many”? How do we know they fear these norms – there must be signs of resistance to make this claim. It would be helpful to have this claim substantiated.

We have revised this section accordingly.

* 1. “In practice only a few countries’ parliaments have shown an interest in the briefs provided by the OECD Governing Board.” Which countries? How do we know this? Why might that be? This is a point for discussion that is absent.

We have revised this section accordingly.

1. Finally, the acknowledgement of the critiques of OECD policies on p. 10 (last two paragraphs) is weak and should be more fully developed. The section is lacking citation and examples from the literature to illustrate these critiques. The reader is left to take the author/s at his/her/their word that these critiques; the substance of those critiques is simply absent other than broad generalizing statements. This section needs to be more fully elaborated otherwise the paper reads as a general literature review, that fails to meet its goal of discussing the normative influence of OECD on “the educational policy sphere”.

We have added a number of references to more fully support these critiques.

1. One recommendation here is that the paper tries to achieve too much. Its scope may be too broad (in describing the normative influence of the OECD). Perhaps the authors might want to focus more specifically on the Canadian context, for example, with more specific analysis of how Canadian policy is governed through OECD programs. Of course, this requires a navigating the provincial/federal jurisdictional considerations for education policy, but without specificity in the analysis, the reader is left to wonder how this normative governance really matters when the paper is writ so broad.

As per our previous discussion – we have maintained the focus on both Canada and the international community – this was agreed to prior to submission.

I think there is some promise to this paper. The descriptive nature to the first part of the paper that reviews the three OECD programs is useful for those unfamiliar with the context. However, the paper needs a serious revision if it is to make a unique contribution to the expansive literature on the OECD in education.