



Positionality Worksheet for Facilitators and Organisations

FILLABLE WORKSHEET

This worksheet is designed to support organisations planning cross-movement collaborations and/or facilitators of such collaborations to reflect on power dynamics and silos that may impact participants' experiences of the collaboration. Parts of it are adapted from the [Power Analysis Workbook](#) in the [Meaningful Engagement Toolbox](#).

STEP 1

Fill out the name, structure, and primary movement/field columns in the following chart with the names of participants and potential collaborators. See guidance below the chart for assistance. Use multiple pages as needed.

Name	Structure / Role	Primary movement / field	Notes
Host(s) / Convenor(s) / Coordinator(s)			
Groups or Organisational Participants			
Individual Participants			

Guidance for filling out the chart:

- Structure/Role for organisations or groups may include things like 'nonprofit organisation', 'local government agency', 'local business', 'multinational corporation', or 'intergovernmental agency'. Structure/Role for individual participants may include things like 'mental health clinician', 'lived experience expert', 'subject matter expert', 'grassroots activist', 'public speaker', or 'community business leader.'
- For Structure/Role, be clear and detailed about the position – for example, an unpaid grassroots activist has a different positionality than a full-time, paid national policy strategist, even though they may both identify as activists from impacted communities. Similarly, a small business owner has a different positionality than the founder of a multinational corporation, even though they both represent business concerns.
- Primary movement/field may refer to the main movement issue the organisation or person works on, like 'labour rights', 'human trafficking', 'gender-based violence', or 'early childhood trauma'. For businesses, this may list the sector or industry, such as 'marketing and communications', 'fishing', or 'finance'.
- Registered organisations have more institutional power in collaborations, and often have significantly more funding than loosely-structured collectives or individual organisers.
- People from communities impacted by marginalisation often have less institutional power than people with experiences of fewer marginalisations.
- Organisations often have more institutional power than individuals, particularly when it is individuals without access to significant resources or who have historically been excluded from organisational leadership.
- 'Celebrity', even within certain movement- or field-specific niches, can bring a power imbalance. Similarly, speaking the language the collaboration is hosted in, being from a 'Global North' country, or having access to wealth (even if only through your institutional role) can create a power imbalance.

STEP 2

Look over your chart and reflect on power imbalances. Jot down some notes in the Notes column that capture what you notice about potential power imbalances or belonging concerns. Use additional pages if necessary.

Consider:

STEP 3

What is the overall goal or purpose of this collaboration? How was this goal or purpose identified, and who was part of (or not part of) that process?

STEP 4

Reflecting on the chart above, is the host or convenor the right host, convenor, or coordinator for this kind of collaboration? Can the existing power imbalances be mitigated through careful planning or facilitation, or are they too significant? Would it make sense to bring on additional co-hosts, co-convenors, or co-coordinators? Should the current convenor step down and instead resource a different convenor to fill this role?

STEP 5

Reflect on the invitation process: How are/were potential collaborators selected for invitation? Who did/will do the inviting? Using that process, who is likely to be privileged in selection? Who is likely to be excluded or deprioritised? Are there any other groups or individuals we should consider inviting to increase parity and the richness of the dialogue?

Consider: If everyone is invited by one person or organisation, it is likely that that person or organisation's positionality influenced participant selection. Either provide a clear justification for why that was necessary or consider an alternative model for participant selection. Alternative models may include a nomination process with a cross-movement selection board, or a snowball model in which each group invited by the coordinator may invite one of their other trusted collaborative partners. For alternative models, clear guidance around the core function of the collaboration is still important. For example, the cross-movement selection board may develop a rubric for evaluating nominees to clarify their own criteria, or the invited group may discuss criteria that are necessary to the project (e.g. 'willingness to commit to one 3-hour meeting per month' or 'ability to navigate challenging conversations across differences').



COLLECTIVE THREADS INITIATIVE

RECOMMENDED CITATION

Ash, C., Maina, E., and Otiende, S. (2026). *Positionality Worksheet for Facilitators and Organisations in Cross-Movement Dialogues*. 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.