



Cross-Movement Facilitation Planning Worksheet

FILLABLE WORKSHEET

This worksheet is designed to support organisations planning cross-movement collaborations and/or facilitators of such collaborations to plan facilitation strategies that support equitable cross-movement partnerships. It is designed to be the next step following the [Positionality Worksheet for Facilitators and Organisations](#) and refers to the notes.

Reflect on your notes column in the Positionality Worksheet, then fill in your responses to the following questions. Consider engaging any co-hosts or co-coordinators to discuss and respond together.

- 1 How familiar are the convenor(s) and facilitator(s) with the history and norms of the other movements represented in the collaboration? Is there anything facilitators will want to learn before the collaboration begins?**

Remember that different movements may have different historical relationships to government systems and 'charity', and that even within movements, experiences and norms may differ based on racial, gendered, or other differences.

- 2 What safeguards could be established to ensure that the host or coordinator's structure/role, movement, and lived experiences are not prioritised above others throughout the collaboration?**

Don't assume it won't happen. Create a plan to help prevent it, and checks and balances to address it when it does. One example might be that if a collaboration has three co-coordinators from different movements, they include a 'power dynamics and equitable dialogue' debrief and opportunity for course-correction in the regular agenda for their weekly co-coordinator check-in.

3 How will facilitators involve participants in developing the norms, agreements, and expectations for cross-movement dialogue that everyone will be expected to honour? Are there any agreements that are non-negotiable, and how can those be communicated to participants in advance?

For example, facilitators might consider recreating the Positionality Worksheet as a group activity and discussing potential challenges and/or co-creating group agreements during the first meeting. An example of a non-negotiable agreement might be that a collaboration focused on ending racist policing articulates in advance that no proposals for increased criminalisation will be considered or supported.

4 How confident are facilitators that they will recognise when one movement's or structure's norms (or one kind of lived experience) are dominating the dialogue or being taken for granted as 'just how we do things'? How might you invite participants to help facilitators recognise when it is happening?

For example, facilitators might offer participants a simple (and potentially light-hearted) way to indicate when the dialogue feels off-balance — such as holding up a green card to indicate 'something is being assumed to be a norm that isn't a norm for my work' or a

yellow card to indicate 'I'm not feeling like my insights are being included'. Another example is reminding participants at the beginning of each meeting of how to share challenging feedback with the co-coordinators.

5 How will facilitators foster an environment that earns trust among collaborators? How will facilitators agree to manage their own feelings and reactions when receiving feedback during or between collaborative meetings?

Even with systems in place, participants are unlikely to share concerns or feel heard if there is no trust that facilitators will receive and respond to feedback, and expect other participants to engage thoughtfully with difficult feedback. One example: when challenging feedback is shared, facilitators invite the whole group (and themselves) to take a 'three-beat pause', allowing a few seconds of silence to connect with or calm their nervous system before difficult discussions, to minimise reactivity.

6 When you have collaborators from contexts with contradictory expectations, how will you navigate establishing and working together on shared goals?

Collaborative partners may have policy or practice assumptions and norms in direct tension with each other. For example, domestic violence organisations and child advocacy organisations often find themselves in tension when both a child and one of their parents are being abused by the other parent. Some partners advocate for increased criminalisation for certain acts, while others advocate to end mass incarceration of marginalised groups. How will facilitators navigate this?

7 Considering the fundamental values of the work proposed, are there any potential collaborative partners who might not be appropriate for this work? What are the 'hard lines' convenors will maintain for ensuring a space where violence, oppression, and abuse are not tolerated in the name of honouring difference?

It may be that one or more of the potential collaborators initially envisioned might create more harm in the space in a way that cannot be managed at this time even through strong facilitation. It also sometimes happens that these things may not become apparent until the collaboration is already underway.

8 Outside of broad categories of structural power dynamics, reflect on the positionality of the individual representatives at the collaborative table. What can facilitators do to remain aware of these dynamics?

For example, is one the funder of another? Does one work for the government agency that regulates or monitors another? Is one a former client or participant in another's programs? Does one regularly advocate for policies that impede another's work or advocacy? How will facilitators navigate this?



COLLECTIVE THREADS INITIATIVE

RECOMMENDED CITATION

Ash, C., Maina, E., and Otiende, S. (2026). *Cross-Movement Facilitation Planning Worksheet*. Collective Threads Initiative, Nairobi, Kenya. Available from collectivethreads.org/tools-library

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.