



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES (SHORT COURSE)

1340/03/PRE

Paper 3 Presentation

May/June 2016

PRE-RELEASE MATERIAL

To be given to candidates



READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Guidance for Teachers

This Resource Booklet contains stimulus material to be used by candidates preparing their presentation for 1340/03. One copy should be given to each candidate.

Presentations must be prepared in a four-week period. This may take place at any point before 31 May 2016, by which date all presentations must have been submitted to Cambridge via the Cambridge Secure Exchange (MOVEit).

The Presentation is marked out of 40.

Instructions to Candidates

- You should use the enclosed stimulus material to help you identify the subject for your presentation.
- Your presentation should attempt to answer a question.
- Your presentation must address alternative perspectives on the question you select and must engage directly with an issue, an assumption, evidence and/or a line of reasoning in one or more of the documents within this Booklet (i.e. you should not just pick an individual word or phrase which is not central to the reasoning of or the issues covered by the documents).
- You are expected to reflect on these perspectives using your own research.
- Your presentation should be designed for a non-specialist audience.
- Originality in interpretation is welcomed.
- Your presentation may be prepared in a variety of formats and should normally include an oral commentary.
- The speaking or running time of your presentation should be a maximum of 15 minutes.
- Whether presented or not, the submission must include a verbatim transcript of the presentation.

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **13** printed pages and **3** blank pages.

Document 1

'It's never been easier to change the world'

Adapted from an article written by Roz Davies and published in *Health Service Journal*, November 2013.

Roz Davies is a healthcare consultant and manager.

How Twitter, blogging and chat rooms facilitate active citizenship

An active citizen commits to an action that benefits society.

A good place to start in understanding the value and potential of digital citizenship in the context of health and wellbeing is to define what we mean by "active citizenship". The term in itself provokes great debate, but the British Council has a neat definition that we can use for the purposes of this article:

"A citizen who commits his or herself to an action that benefits society."

Some would say we have reached the tipping point in the UK healthcare system to truly recognising the value and impact of active citizenship in health and wellbeing. From community health champions to patient leaders, co-production to asset based community development, citizenship has hit the mainstream.

Great potential

Now the case for active citizenship in health is established, how can we use rapidly evolving and growing digital technology to enhance, support and spread its potential?

'We can choose when and how much to contribute, from spreading a tweet message in a campaign to joining and getting involved in an online community.'

Digital technology fundamentally provides greater choice of how and when to act. It helps people to support each other no matter where they live. We can choose when and how much to contribute, from spreading a tweet message in a campaign to joining and getting involved in an online community, there are multiple ways to make a difference.

We can choose our online persona and keep our identity private. This has been the cause of much concern for very good reason, but a good example of how this can also help people was shared by community health champion Lisa Cox, who was involved in the NHS's 65th anniversary celebrations. She provides online support for people who self-harm as far away as Singapore and says people who anonymously connect online might not be getting help anywhere else.

Social media consultancy Symplur shows an example of how social media is breaking down barriers in healthcare. It says: "Traditional barriers like location, profession, demographics, physical abilities and conditions will not stop you joining in. The world is flattening."

We can campaign and share and spread messages quickly across the globe. You may have noticed the rise of "world days". The internet has enhanced our ability to communicate, raise profile and promote our chosen cause. Twibbons and hashtags have played a growing role for people leading and participating in campaigns.

'New digital citizenship platforms are springing up ever more frequently and arguably a full range of market leaders is yet to emerge.'

We can have conversations with large groups of people connected by values, purpose and common experience, find out and share information about almost anything at the click of a button or swipe of a screen and using open innovation, build and grow new ideas together.

Document 2**‘Does crowdsourcing vital issues make sense?’**

Adapted from an article in *Business Mirror*, a Philippine newspaper, November 2013.

Social media, whatever the form, are becoming an increasingly significant way for people to communicate and push their ideas. Any time you hear of a protest in the world, you can be sure that social media have played a part in the organization and holding of that demonstration.

The new catchphrase of those who see social media as a force for public discussion is “crowdsourcing.” According to Wikipedia, Wired magazine contributing editor Jeff Howe and features editor Mark Robinson “coined the term ‘crowdsourcing’ in 2005 after conversations about how businesses were using the Internet to outsource work to individuals. Howe and Robinson came to the conclusion that what was happening was like ‘outsourcing to the crowd.’”

In the Philippines, from those who advocate using the Internet to encourage public action, the logical progression is that the crowdsourcing of Filipinos be used to effect a change in the Constitution. Some individuals are now calling for a people’s initiative to draft a new Constitution. Using the recent example of Iceland’s Stjórnlagaráð, where ordinary Facebook and Twitter users joined together online to collectively draft a new charter, advocates of crowdsourcing initiatives, such as retired Chief Justice Reynato S. Puno, believe that it gives better representation to the people.

Crowdsourcing the creation of a new Constitution is said to allow the opinions of the masses to be heard, stop the abuses by political leaders, implement laws that protect and guarantee the rights of individuals, and create a fairer and more balanced system that caters directly to the needs of the people.

Veteran journalist Carmen Pedrosa wrote that, “by crowdsourcing a new Constitution, we return sovereignty to the people. That would mean a lot of patience in calibrating what the people say with what constitutional experts think is the right way to frame their desires for good governance, and not just on the issue of the Priority Development Assistance Fund or the Disbursement Acceleration Program.”

Although the ideals and objectives of using Internet crowdsourcing may be noble, it is not without its own set of issues and repercussions. Only 34 percent of Filipinos have viable and affordable access to the Internet, lower than the Southeast Asian average. This makes online crowdsourcing available only to those in the middle and upper socioeconomic classes, who have gadgets and Internet access.

Further, while the Internet provides a large amount of information, people are just as narrow-minded about sourcing their “facts” as they were in the days of a single hometown newspaper. US legal scholar Cass Sunstein wrote that political discussions online can lead to “cyberbalkanization” – a term used for discussions that lead to more disagreements, rather than creating a consensus. Because the Internet allows people to access a large number of information sources, it can also enable them to pinpoint the ones they agree with and ignore those they disagree with.

Crowdsourcing is easily used by some people to push their own agenda under the guise of educating people on the issues. Because there is never a general consensus among people concerning the issues, a crowdsourcing effort can actually create greater division, rather than the unity and representation it claims to advocate. Unless we have a better-informed population that clearly understand what is good or bad for them and the nation, any grassroots effort, such as crowdsourcing a Constitution, may create a worse situation rather than a better one. Technology is only a tool, not a solution.

Document 3**‘E-views: Crowdsourcing’**

An article written by Simon Parry and published in *Labour Research*, a UK magazine, May 2013.

Simon Parry is a freelance consultant who specialises in trade unions.

Crowdsourcing is a form of working made possible by the internet. It means getting work or funding from a large group of people, usually from the online community. The basic idea is to use the skills, ideas and participation of a large group of people to help build products or content. People can work flexibly from home anywhere in the world, as long as they can deliver the goods.

While crowdsourcing has been around for a while, it's been growing rapidly over the last few years. Estimates suggest that the market is worth billions of dollars now, with "crowdfunding" alone estimated to be worth \$2.8 billion in 2012.

But there are problems. There is next to no regulation, pay can be very low, and workers have few rights or recourse when things go wrong. Some might be making good money by working through crowdsourcing, while others face exploitation. However, there are signs that things are changing, with workers starting to organise. One of the first crowdsourcing websites was Amazon's Mechanical Turk (AMT), a service that allows small menial tasks to be crowdsourced for pennies at a time. There is no obligation or consequences if the work "requestor" decides not to pay up and reject the work.

This can have a big impact on low paid workers. A small survey carried out by Lilly Irani at the University of California showed that 20% of the workers on AMT rely on this income to make ends meet. To address this, a review service, Turkopticon (<http://turkopticon.differenceengines.com>), has been launched by Irani and her colleagues.

It enables workers on AMT to rate the various employers, helping other workers identify and avoid the worst "requestors", while supporting the better paying ones. Other crowdsourcing platforms are taking a more ethical position.

MobileWorks, which launched in 2011, was built as an alternative to AMT. Rather than having anonymous, underpaid workers with little incentive to do a great job, MobileWorks aims to pay a fair amount, with a minimum wage which reflects the cost of living of the crowdsourced worker's country. Also, workers are not anonymous, have a better choice of tasks and are encouraged to self-organise, something MobileWorks sees both as a worker's right and as a boost to revenue. With crowdsourcing looking set to continue to grow, moving towards professional and higher value work, it's important that online workers seize the opportunity to organise.

Document 4**‘Questioning the Crowd – Data Verification Challenges for Humanitarians’**

Adapted from an article published by IRIN, a Nairobi-based news service of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), August 2013.

There are many plusses to crowd-sourced information. “It addresses a real pain for humanitarian organizations: situational awareness in unstable environments,” Chris Albon, director of data projects at Kenyan crisis mapping organization Ushahidi, told IRIN. “The data gathered by crowdsourcing technologies can provide humanitarian organizations with new and powerful streams of intelligence about the area in which they are, or will soon be, operating.”

However, information that comes from multiple, on-the-ground sources is no guarantee of its accuracy. In a crisis situation information can be limited, unreliable and poorly analyzed.

As Paul Currion, an IT and humanitarian coordination specialist and consultant for the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA – a Geneva-based NGO network on humanitarian developments), put it: “Crowd-sourcing is almost never going to be representative, because the crowd is by definition self-selected. This isn’t a huge problem as long as it is recognized, and as long as crowd-sourcing is not the only source of data.”

For example, Somalia Speaks, set up by Al Jazeera in 2011 ahead of the 2013 London Conference on Somalia, asked Somalis, using text messages, to send in their views and questions for their government about the conference. Although they received more than 3,000 replies, the International Telecommunications Union estimates that mobile penetration within Somalia is only 7 percent. Therefore the views texted in are unlikely to be widely representative of all Somali people. “It’s therefore a mistake to talk about “speaking to” people in the context of crowd-sourcing, because what you’re really doing is “soliciting from” people,” Currion told IRIN.

The technology used to crowd-source information may be inappropriate. During the May 2013 Boston bombings, the public became actively engaged in attempting to identify the perpetrator of the attack, and unfortunately, initially pinned the crime on the wrong person. Through websites such as Reddit, a social news and entertainment service in which users submit content that is rated “up” or “down” by the crowd, the rumours went viral.

Patrick Meier, director of social media at Qatar Foundation’s Computing Research Institute (QCRI) and a leading expert in the field of using new technologies for crisis response, argues that a significant problem with websites such as Reddit, Twitter and Facebook is that they allow people to re-transmit the information without personally assessing its veracity.

“Reddit is not designed for critical thinking. People posted all sorts of dubious information [regarding the Boston bombings] and it snowballed,” Meier told IRIN. Meier argues that if a technology could force people to analyze the truth of what they were reporting, crowdsourcing could be better harnessed within crisis situations.

Benjamin Davies, deputy director of the “signal program on human security and technology” at Harvard’s Humanitarian Initiative, believes it is easier to trust the crowd if it is given relatively straightforward tasks using a platform they are already familiar with, given decision-making after a crisis “is very erratic”.

For instance, after the 2012 US Hurricane Sandy, there was a petrol crisis around the city of New York so Google created an app next to their maps, enabling people to put a “thumbs up” or “thumbs down” relating to petrol availability.

But the massive knowledge gap that currently exists between the humanitarian community and those developing these technologies remains an impediment to making these tools work for humanitarians and disaster-affected people. OCHA has recommended several ways to bridge this gap, in its recent report: *Humanitarianism in the Network Age*. These include setting up deployable field teams made up of humanitarians, techies and others; creating a neutral forum for people in the technology community, humanitarians and volunteers to share ideas before and after a disaster takes place; setting data standards; and creating more room for research and development within humanitarian agencies.

For Imogen Wall, OCHA coordinator of communications with affected communities, there are “very few answers. The world is changing too fast for that. Get into the field, apply the principles and see what effectiveness looks like where you are. It will, in practice, look different everywhere. That’s because communication is a social and cultural activity, no matter what tool you use, and is different everywhere.”

Document 5**‘Social media in Pakistan’**

Adapted from an article in *The Frontier Post*, a Pakistani newspaper, August 2013 written by Ahtesham Katikhel.

Social media is a new term which the Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines as the forms of electronic communication (as Web sites for social networking and micro-blogging) through which users create online communities to share information, ideas, personal messages, and other content (as videos).

In Pakistan, the number of internet users is constantly on the rise. According to some estimates there are 30 million people in the country that have access to the Internet. Also there are 120 million mobile subscribers in Pakistan that make it the fifth largest mobile phone market in Asia. Facebook is currently the most widely used social media website with nine million users in the country.

Social media has vast political and social potential and enormous power and influence that was demonstrated, for example, in the so-called Arab Spring. The most active ingredient and catalyst for change in Arab Spring was the leading role of social media which it played in gathering and organizing the protesting masses against the rules. It provided a very important channel of communication. And later we saw that Arab Spring was successful in overthrowing many authoritarian regimes and replacing them with representative democracy. The absolute success of Arab Spring is another thing, but one thing that is clear is that social media has introduced new techniques of mass protests that are peaceful yet successful in nature.

It is also an evidence of its success that, against the backdrop of Arab Spring, in many Arab countries restrictions were put in place on the use of social media so that its vital role of awaking the people against discrimination could be checked and the status quo be maintained in those countries.

At present, social media is very swiftly and successfully overtaking the traditional media. Going by this logic, some media experts are of the opinion that in the near future it will fully take the place of mainstream media. One of the main causes of social media’s success in this sphere is the ‘urgency’ factor.

By virtue of this very characteristic today Twitter and some other social networks and websites are much ahead of mainstream media in breaking news. Twitter has become a very viable and handy source of information-gathering not only in Pakistan but also in the whole world.

In Pakistan, the state of social media is very disappointing. The healthy use of social media is a rare commodity in the country. One of the best examples of how social media is used in Pakistan is its role in the recent general elections. Every political party used social media for its election campaign.

The workers as well as critics of different political parties used social media to project their views and to attract and engage people to vote for their desired party or candidate(s). But to a vigilant user of social media, it is evident that social media was mainly used for mud slinging and for accusation and counter accusation among the sympathizers and opponents of various political groups.

The character assassination of prominent leaders and personalities and posting of defamatory comments against them on social networks were the order of the day. Besides, due to improper use, it has become a major source of spreading junk, fabricated and baseless news stories, images and articles that promote intolerance and bigotry among the youth – two thirds of the country’s Facebook users are below the age of 25.

With mobile subscribers adding one million a month and 44 thousand new users joining Facebook every week, social media in Pakistan is getting more popular by the day.

But in spite of the popularity we still have to go a long way before we can reap the fruits of it. This is only possible by proper and mature use of it and for this to happen we have to undertake some concrete steps such as promotion of quality education, harmony and tolerance in our society etc. And, to me, honestly speaking, the future of social media in Pakistan looks very bright!

Document 6**‘Study: Crowdsourcing a Valuable Resource in Medicine’**

An article in *Harvard Crimson*, a newspaper published by Harvard University, February 2013.

Crowdsourcing, posing a question, problem, or idea on the internet with the hope of soliciting responses from other web-users, has emerged as a valuable new method of soliciting ideas and solutions in the medical field, according to a case study conducted jointly by researchers at Harvard Medical School, Harvard Business School, London Business School, and web-based innovation company TopCoder. “The beauty of crowdsourcing is that it provides access to people that you would never normally meet,” said Ramy A. Arnaout, an assistant professor of pathology at the Medical School and Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. Arnaout, who co-authored the study, examined the impact of providing cash prizes to software developers and programmers on the web to encourage responses to a computational biological problem.

Arnaout said that the study – which was released in the scientific journal *Nature Biotechnology* on Feb. 7 – showed that crowdsourcing is “100 percent beneficial,” calling the solutions from TopCoder users “mind-bogglingly elegant.” Of the 122 responses to Arnaout’s TopCoder post, 16 of the algorithm solutions were more efficient and accurate than the ones produced by Arnaout and 30 beat the well-established National Institute of Health’s MegaBLAST benchmark, according to the study. Associate professor at the Medical School Eva C. Guinan, who also worked on the study, said that while researchers had originally been working with four to five approaches to the problem, the submissions provided 89 new ways to approach the problem.

Although crowdsourcing traditionally only has been employed in more commercial settings, the scope of the study suggests that there is a place for crowdsourcing in scientific and medical fields.

“In our pursuit of knowledge we can leverage the knowledge of other people around the world,” said Harvard Business School assistant professor Karim R. Lakhani. Robert Hughes, the president of TopCoder, said he believes that scientists will soon be able to use crowdsourcing to sift through large data sets, utilizing a global community to answer complicated problems.

Guinan echoed Hughes, saying that web-based crowdsourcing could prove valuable in academic problem-solving.

“I think that in many ways the core message here is that in a complicated world where time and resource are limiting, you need to be aware of the means at your disposal to make progress in the most efficient way you can,” she said.

Document 7**‘Religious freedom, secular forum’**

Adapted from an article written by Kenan Malik and published in *The New York Times*, a US newspaper, January 2014.

Kenan Malik is a writer, lecturer and broadcaster on religion and multiculturalism.

Religion is no longer the crucible in which political and intellectual disputes take place. Questions of freedom and tolerance are not about how the dominant religious establishment should respond to dissenting theological views, but about the degree to which society should tolerate, and the law permit, speech and activity that might be offensive or hateful, that might challenge the state or undermine national security.

From questions of blasphemy to divisions over same-sex marriage, the fractiousness of such debates reflects growing tensions between some strands of religious thought and the changing demands of a secular society. It also reflects a deep-set confusion over what is meant by “religious freedom.”

Most Western societies have, for historical reasons, come to think of “religious freedom” as a special kind of liberty. The modern debate about tolerance and rights developed in Europe from the 17th century onward, primarily within a religious framework. Questions about what could be tolerated were, at heart, questions of how, and how far, the state and the established church should accommodate religious dissent.

From today’s perspective, it is easier to see that religious freedom is not a special kind of liberty, but one expression of a broader set of freedoms of conscience, belief, assembly and action.

Whatever one’s beliefs, secular or religious, there should be complete freedom to express them, short of inciting violence. Whatever one’s beliefs, there should be freedom to assemble to promote them. And whatever one’s beliefs, there should be freedom to act upon those beliefs, so long as, in so doing, one neither physically harms another individual nor transgresses that individual’s rights in the public sphere. These should be the fundamental principles by which we judge the permissibility of any belief or act, religious or secular.

Many on both sides of the debate about religious freedom fail to grasp these principles. Many secularists, for instance, insist that religious views should be kept out of the public sphere. That cannot be right, any more than it would be right to bar the views of racists, conservatives, Communists or gay activists from the public sphere.

Many believers want to retain privileges for religion. As a society, we should tolerate as far as possible the desire of people, religious or secular, to live according to their consciences. But that tolerance ends when someone acting upon his or her conscience causes harm to another or infringes on another’s rights. So religions should have no right to prevent the publication of material believers deem offensive. Religious freedom requires that people of faith be allowed to speak or act in ways that might offend others; it does not require that others do not cause them offence.

There is nothing wrong with the American government’s requiring Catholic-run hospitals to give employees health insurance that includes free contraception: Churches are not being forced to provide contraception. In their role as secular employers, they are being asked to provide benefits that all employers must provide. To exempt church-run organizations would be to deny those benefits to a particular group of employees.

A religious institution should be free to bar women from acting as clergy members or to segregate the sexes in religious services or private meetings. But enforced segregation in a public forum is a different matter and must be opposed.

All this is not, as many believers suggest, to enforce secular discrimination against religious belief. Many nonreligious groups – fascists, Communists, Greens – could claim that their beliefs mandated certain actions or practices. Yet, it would be illegal for a racist café owner to bar black people, or for Greens to destroy a farmer's field of legally grown genetically modified crops, however deep-set their particular beliefs. There is a line, in other words, that cannot be crossed – even if conscience demands it. That line should be in the same place for religious believers as for nonbelievers.

Document 8

'Is France right to ban wearing the burka in public?'

Adapted from an article in *The Observer*, a UK newspaper, March 2010.

Egyptian-born columnist and lecturer Mona Eltahawy argues in favour of the proposed French ban on the burka in public; actor and playwright Stephanie Street takes the opposite view.

YES: Mona Eltahawy

As a Muslim woman and as a feminist I support banning the face veil, everywhere and not just in France.

I am appalled to hear the defence of the *niqab* or *burka* in Europe. A bizarre political correctness has tied the tongues of those who would normally rally to defend women's rights but who are now instead sacrificing those very rights in the name of fighting an increasingly powerful right wing.

Every time I return to Cairo from New York City, where I now live, I wonder what Hoda Shaarawi, the pioneering Egyptian feminist, would say if she could see how many of her sisters are disappearing behind the face veil. Returning from an international women's conference in Italy in 1923 – yes, we had feminists that early in Egypt – Shaarawi famously removed her face veil at a Cairo train station, declaring it a thing of the past. We might not have burned our bras in Egypt but some have described Shaarawi's gesture as even more incendiary for its time.

And yet here we are, almost a century later, arguing over a woman's "right" to cover her face. What is lost in those arguments is that the ideology that promotes the *niqab* (the total body covering that leaves just the eyes exposed) and the *burka* (the garment which covers the eyes with a mesh) does not believe in the concept of women's rights to begin with.

It is an ideology that describes women alternately as candy, a diamond ring or a precious stone that needs to be hidden to prove her "worth". That is not a message Muslims learn in our holy book, the Qur'an, nor is the face veil prescribed by the majority of Muslim scholars.

The racism and discrimination that Muslim minorities face in many countries — such as France, which has the largest Muslim community in Europe, and Britain, where two members of the xenophobic British National party were shamefully elected to the European parliament — are very real. But the silence of the left wing and liberals isn't the way to fight it. The best way to support Muslim women would be to say we oppose both the racist right wing and the *niqabs* and *burkas* which are products of what I call the Muslim right wing. Women should not be sacrificed to either.

NO: Stephanie Street

Over the last five years I interviewed 43 British Muslim women for my play, *Sisters*, a verbatim piece constructed from those interviews. My intention was to dispel the ludicrous notion that there is a single, fixed Muslim female identity. As a non-Muslim who grew up in Singapore surrounded by Muslim women, I was shocked by the mainstream response to 9/11 and 7/7 which was, obliquely, the polarisation of "us" and "them". Probably the most offensive thing about it all was how few commentators and analysts in the media, or people in positions of power, had ever spoken in person to a Muslim woman.

To whatever extent a Muslim woman chooses to practise it, modesty is a central concern within the religion (for men as well, although this is often ignored). Everyone I spoke to who wore Islamic dress did so because this issue of modesty is sacrosanct, and they felt liberated not being judged on their appearance. And those who choose to wear the *niqab* are doing that to an extreme.

Only one character in my play wears the *niqab*, but the issue of Islamic dress came up in every interview I did. Azra (not her real name), who wore the full covering, was young, had a job and wore it against her parents' wishes. They felt that she would be discriminated against for wearing it.

She took it off when she went to work because she had to, knowing she was "going to get the reward for the time I was wearing it, making God happy by fulfilling his covenant to me".

She related to me an incident that took place when she had her photo taken for her university ID. They requested she remove her *niqab*, so she asked for a female photographer. When the male photographer at the adjacent booth asked if she'd like the men to look away, she told them not to worry about it, not wanting to cause a scene. And when he did still turn away, she was touched: "I thought, I just wish people could be kind like that."

France clearly needs to address why immigrant Muslims and French converts are rejecting western identity so demonstratively, but this proposed ban is not the way. There is the not insignificant problem that it might contravene articles 8 and 9 of the European convention on human rights which protect the individual's right to a private life and personal identity and freedom to manifest one's religion.

There is no denying that in certain countries the *burqa* is a manifestation of the oppression of women, but in the west it is nearly always worn out of choice. It is an issue of how a person chooses to practise their faith, and in a democracy we cannot deny any human being that.

BLANK PAGE

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cie.org.uk after the live examination series.

Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.