**Proposed RFP evaluation criteria**

We evaluate applications on a 100-point scale in four categories, supported by further comments (3-5 sentences) on each criterion

**Quality of applicant(s) and Host Institution(s)** (20)

Do the named project participants have the requisite research background, track-record, and ambition to complete the proposed project? Does the host intuition have the administrative capability to support the project? Are the applicant(s) and host institution in a position to succeed on the proposed project? Is there evidence that the applicant(s) are willing to take risks in their research trajectory? Does the applicant have a track record of teamwork? Is there evidence that the applicant can successfully work with the project scientific team?

**Relevance of subproject to the larger goals of the project** (30)

Do the goals, methods, outputs, and outcomes address project Guiding Questions and approaches? Is there a clear empirical or experimental element, or at least one that allows for empirical operationalization? Is there evidence that the applicant(s) can successfully work with directors and co-directors? Does the project engage manuscript traditions represented in the Chester Beatty collection?

**Quality of proposal** (30)

Is the project of outstanding academic quality? Does it have a strong empirical/experimental component that addresses aesthetic cognitivism and manuscripts/paratexts with a high capacity for success? Does the project have a high capacity for success overall?

**Budget** (20)

Is the budget appropriate for the project? Is it good value for money? Does it raise any red flags?

**Should the project be funded?** (yes; maybe; no)

**Further comments**

Please give 3-5 sentences of additional comments on the suitability of the proposal for the larger project.