## Background

*Below is the Transformational Relationship Evaluation Scale (TRES II) for partnership assessment. For more information on question development and assessment strategy, please reference:* [Kniffin, L., Camo-Biogradlija, J., Price, M. F., Kohl, E., Dickovick, A. D. C., Williams, J., ... & Bringle, R. G. (2020). Relationships and Partnerships in Community–Campus Engagement: Evolving Inquiry and Practice. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, *8*(1), 18586](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/leadership_facpubs/5/) and[Clayton, Patti H., et al. "Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 16.2 (2010): 5-21](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ904630). *Also consider sharing responses with your community organization to further facilitate long-term, sustainable, mutually beneficial, reciprocal partnerships.*

## Transformational Relationship Evaluation Scale (TRES) II

TRES II consists of 10 items related to domains of the partnership entity (or, with modified language, dyads, triads, or networks), including, for example, goals, conflict, decision-making, resources, power, and satisfaction (see Table 2). The scale can be completed by one person, both members of a dyad, multiple individuals, members of a partnership entity, or any combination of these. In addition, some users (including the original partnership entity that helped develop TRES II) have sought ancillary information by including three additional items about the impact (on respondents, their organizations, others) of the partnership entity, each with five response options related to potential transformation.

Approaches to gauge the transactional and transformational dimensions of service-learning and community engagement (SLCE) relationships and partnerships as key to enacting the paradigm of democratic engagement. Enables examination of the characteristics of any SLCE relationship in terms of the degree to which it is viewed by its members as exploitive, transactional, or transformational. Offering a finer level of discrimination and enabling more precise assessment of the characteristics of a relationship than the conceptual exploitative-transactional-transformational (E-T-T) continuum alone, the scale consists of items in nine domains: outcomes, goals, decision-making, resources, conflict, identity formation, power, significance, and satisfaction and change for the better. Item response options for each domain represent points along the E-T-T continuum.

### Table 2

*TRES II Domains and Items*

Instructions: The following survey is focused on a community–campus partnership. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate your general impressions about the partnership and select only one alternative that best represents your experience in the partnership. Mark with an “X” the alternative that best characterizes the actual nature of the partnership from your point of view. Mark with an “\*” the alternative that best characterizes the desired nature of the partnership from your point of view (if desired is the same as actual, please put “X\*” next to your selection).

1. *Goals*:
   1. The goals of some of the partners are not known and are hampered, and this causes harm.
   2. Only some of the partners’ goals are acted on, but that is not harmful to anybody.
   3. The distinct goals of all the partners are important to and nurtured by the partnership.
   4. We share common, integrated, and expanding goals that are “our” goals (not “mine” and “yours” separately).
2. *Conflict:*
   1. Conflict remains unacknowledged or is avoided, and this causes harm to the partners.
   2. Conflict is acknowledged and partly managed such that underlying issues are unresolved but neither the partners nor partnership is harmed.
   3. Conflict is successfully resolved by the partners.
   4. Conflict is embraced by the partners as a catalyst to generate new possibilities for the partnership.
3. *Decision-making:*
   1. Some of the partners make decisions in ways that do not involve all of us, and those decisions advantage at least one of us.
   2. Decisions are made in isolation but with consideration of the other partners.
   3. Partners make decisions through a means acceptable to all, and the decisions reached serve us individually.
   4. Partners carefully weigh possibilities and determine together how decisions are made, and the decisions we make benefit the partnership as well as the individual partners.
4. *Resources (e.g., material goods, time, expertise, money)*:
   1. Some partners take resources from others and/or there is no consideration of what is appropriate for each to contribute; some partners are harmed as a result.
   2. Some partners contribute resources to and for other partners, who are not thought to have resources to contribute.
   3. Partners exchange existing resources for mutual benefit.
   4. Investment of resources is equitable (even if unequal, our contributions are proportional to our means), new resources are generated, and resources are understood to be collective (not “mine” and “yours”).
5. *Role of this partnership in each partner’s work:*
   1. The work of some partners is hindered by participating in the partnership.
   2. The partnership advances the distinct work of some partners through the contributions of others
   3. The distinct work of all partners is advanced through the contributions of others.
   4. Partners co-create work that we see as “our” work, and our individual and collective capacity to understand and do the work is enhanced.
6. *Role of this partnership in sense of self (for example, confidence, agency, voice):*
   1. The sense of self of one or some partners is weakened by participating in the partnership.
   2. The partnership contributes to the distinct sense of self of some partners through the contributions of others.
   3. The distinct sense of self of all partners is strengthened through the contributions of others
   4. The sense of self of all partners is deepened by developing a joint sense of self (as members of the partnership).
7. *Extent and nature of interactions:*
   1. Interactions among partners are negative for some of us.
   2. Some partners control the extent and nature of interactions, but the intent is for them to be positive.
   3. A range of interactions is decided upon with contributions by all partners.
   4. The variety of frequent interactions that partners design goes beyond what any of us would otherwise do on our own and support the growth of partners (and the partnership).
8. *Power (in other words, the ability to have influence)*:
   1. Some partners are taken advantage of through others’ uses of power, and their own power is not recognized.
   2. Some partners use their power for the benefit of (some) others as those others have defined it.
   3. The power of all partners is combined, and all of us have the power to enhance the equity of power distribution.
   4. The joint power of all partners generates new sources of and ways to use power, within each of us and as a partnership.
9. *Outcomes*:
   1. This partnership undermines outcomes that matter to some partners.
   2. This partnership advances outcomes that matter to some (but not all) partners individually.
   3. This partnership enables all partners to attain outcomes that matter to us.
   4. This partnership cultivates individual and collective growth while allowing everyone to attain outcomes that are individually and jointly meaningful.
10. *Satisfaction*:
    1. Most of us are dissatisfied with this partnership.
    2. Most are satisfied with this partnership, but some are dissatisfied.
    3. All of us are satisfied with this partnership.
    4. Most or all of us are more than satisfied with this partnership; it exceeds our expectations.