

CHEF iQ Studio App Challenge Overview

- [Goal](#)
- [Project Overview](#)
 - [Objective](#)
 - [Basic features of the Studio App](#)
 - [Beyond the basics](#)
 - [Why a separate app?](#)
- [Timeline](#)
- [Deliverables](#)
- [Rules](#)
 - [Participation](#)
 - [Teams](#)
 - [Advisors](#)
 - [Resources](#)
- [Judging Criteria](#)
 - [Idea \(20 pts\)](#)
 - [Execution \(40 pts\)](#)
 - [Deliverables \(10 pts\)](#)
 - [Midpoint Check-in \(5 pts\)](#)
- [Awards](#)
 - [Best App Award](#)
 - [Category Awards](#)

Date	Change
15 Sep 2025 (Current)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Made changes to the “awards” section: 1) Designated awards for 1st-8th place winners, 2) Removed Category awards, and 3) increased payout for 3rd-5th place winners.• Reduced Advisor time from 8 to 4 hours.

10 Sep 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under “basic features of the app,” removed the line about "publishing “to the CHEF iQ database” to avoid confusion about having to publish to the real database. • Under “basic features of the app,” reword section about “Recipes support everything expected from Guided Cooking” to not imply that those are requirements for the Challenge. • Moved sign up deadline to 17 Sep 2025 and made team matching 15 Sep 2025 • Under “deliverables,” removed requirements for Testflight and App Tester as deployment methods (participants can use any). Furthermore, include progressive web apps as a possible deliverable as well. • Discussed outside help under “resources”.
08 Sep 2025	Initial version

Goal

The challenge aims to leverage the ingenuity of the Chefman and CHEF iQ team to quickly create impactful product features for our biggest initiatives. User Generated Recipes, or UGR, is an initiative foundational for diversifying CHEF iQ from a purely hardware business to one where software can generate meaningful revenue. Our users want a wide variety of recipe content, and the growth of our product line further emphasizes that that we need a scalable way to deliver it. By building a substantial and diverse recipe library, we can drive deeper engagement in the app and, from there, begin turning that value into a sustainable software business. Our own users will write the recipes they crave, and they will do so on our platform—the one place where they can discover, shop, cook, and share their culinary creations.

Project Overview

Build a standalone mobile app that enables creative home cooks to author recipes for the CHEF iQ platform.

Objective

The latest CHEF iQ appliance, the iQ MiniOven, was released without Guided Cooking recipe content. Developing these recipes requires significant time from the culinary and video teams and is unsustainable as our product lineup continues to grow. At the same time, many CHEF iQ users have come to expect recipes, and the seamless integration between content and appliance is one of our biggest differentiators. Rather than eliminating recipes, we want to explore an alternative.

For this Challenge, build a mobile app (“Studio App”) that enables CHEF iQ users to author their own recipes and publish them in the main CHEF iQ app, where others can cook them using Guided Cooking. This approach taps into the creativity and generosity of hundreds of thousands of users eager to share their culinary creations with the CHEF iQ community. In turn, it allows us to scale the volume and variety of recipes on the platform while giving users a stronger sense of ownership and belonging.

Basic features of the Studio App

These features outline what a Studio App in production should be able to do. While completing every feature is encouraged, it is not necessary for the purposes of the Challenge.

Users can:

- Upload or author a recipe.
- View an overview of that recipe.
- Edit the recipe.
- Publish the recipe.

Recipes support can support features including but not limited to:

- Step-by-step instructions, with photos and videos.
- Integration with CHEF iQ appliances (e.g., starting and stopping cook functions at specific steps).
- Ingredients with amounts.
- Metadata such as difficulty, yield, cook time, and search tags (cuisine, diet, course, etc.).

The capabilities listed above are part of Guided Cooking in today's CHEF iQ app and CHEF iQ Recipe Console. Teams determine the extent to which their projects should support those features, or even what new features should be supported instead. In other words, being able to accomplish all the features outlined above is valuable but not required.

Beyond the basics

Accomplishing all the basic requirements in an intuitive and polished way is already a feat. However, the Challenge also rewards apps that extend beyond the basics — by supporting target users more deeply, applying cutting-edge technology, and aligning with business goals.

- **Create incentive:** Consider features that strengthen creative home cooks' motivation to share their recipes.
- **Remove blockers:** Find ways to make recipe upload and editing effortless, so creators spend their time crafting recipes instead of fiddling with the app.
- **Expand value:** Include features for creators to make their recipes more adaptable, engaging, and rewarding for those who cook them.

Why a separate app?

Today, the CHEF iQ app already serves multiple purposes. It is primarily how users monitor and control their cooking sessions remotely. Beyond that, they manage their appliances, learn cooking techniques, and—most relevantly—explore recipes. Though diverse, all of these features are aimed at home cooks who are consuming content.

In contrast, recipe authoring serves a much smaller segment of users. [On YouTube, only 115 million channels exist out of 2.6 billion users \(4.4%\). Allrecipes reports 200 new recipes weekly from 15 million registered users.](#) While small in number, these creators are

incredibly valuable because their contributions impact many other users. Thus, we want to make their experience as seamless as possible.

The needs of someone cooking with the CHEF iQ app are very different from those of someone creating recipes. Adding authoring tools to the existing CHEF iQ app risks bloating it with features few will use, while also diluting the authoring experience itself. A standalone Studio app allows both content creators and content consumers to have an experience tailored to their use case.

Finally, in the context of a competition, building a separate app frees us from preconceived notions or legacy designs. A clean slate means we don't have to work around existing components and frameworks in the CHEF iQ app. Even if, in the future, we choose to merge content creation and consumption into one product, exploring these ideas in a greenfield state will have been invaluable.

Timeline

Start Date	End Date	Event
08 Sep 2025	12 Sep 2025	Team formation
15 Sep 2025		Team matching released
17 Sep 2025		Sign-ups end / Challenge begins!
20 Oct 2025	24 Oct 2025	Midpoint check ins
14 Nov 2025		App build, code, and documentation due
17 Nov 2025	21 Nov 2025	Presentations and judging
21 Nov 2025		Winners announced

Deliverables

Deployed App

Android, iOS, or a progressive web app. Should be delivered to the judge's phones as an installation package. Judges must receive a version of the app that they should not have to build on their personal computers.

Code Repository

Hosted on **Bitbucket** or **GitHub**, with a project that runs on judges' machines with minimal support. A **README** with clear setup instructions must be included.

Written Documentation

Delivered as a **PDF** or on **Confluence**, detailing the **design process**, as well as **product and business considerations**. Supplementary materials (e.g., Figma wireframes, diagrams, spreadsheets) should be included as appropriate.

Presentation

Delivered during judging week, including a **live or recorded demo** and a **Q&A session**.

Rules

Participation

Any Chefman employee is eligible to participate in the Challenge. Individuals directly involved with administering, judging, or advising for the Challenge are ineligible. While the deliverables require a fully formed app to be submitted, no formal coding experience is required.

Work on the Challenge should primarily be done outside of regular working hours. Participants' main responsibilities must not be impacted; if they are, participants may be disqualified at the discretion of the Challenge administrators. Participants may use working hours to seek help from Advisors and to participate in the Midpoint Check-ins and Judging Week presentations.

Teams

Teams may consist of 1–4 participants.

Each team should designate a Team Captain to manage all Challenge-related communications.

Participants may be members of multiple teams, provided all involved teams agree to the level of that participant's involvement. Participants on multiple teams are expected to contribute unique work to each team, not reuse or duplicate the same deliverables.

Awards are given per team. Distribution of funds is determined by the team internally and communicated to the Challenge administrator by the Team Captain. If a team cannot reach an agreement or no specific request is made, funds will be divided equally among all team members.

Advisors

Each team may request guidance, resources, or help from the following Advisors. Each Advisor may provide up to 4 hours of support per team throughout the Challenge Period, subject to their availability:

Technical Guidance: Help with project setup, consulting about AI, understanding CHEF iQ APIs and data, and software development in general.

- Mihir Patel, VP of Architecture & Infrastructure
- Deeptesh Patel, SVP of Software, Experience, and Infrastructure, CHEF iQ

Culinary Guidance: Help with understanding recipe development process, the Guided Cooking feature, perspectives on target users, and anything related to culinary arts.

- Megan Scrivner, Culinary Operations Manager

Product Guidance: Help with product and business goals, feedback on user experience, presentation and documentation.

- Jonathan Shieh, Product Manager, CHEF iQ

Resources

Additional resources outside of your day to day work, such as AI coding or design tools, can be reimbursed with prior approval on a case-by-case basis. Payment for the resources would be limited to just the competition period. Free trials before committing a single tool is highly encouraged.

Outside help from those who are not Chefman employees is allowed. The Chefman employees on the team are still responsible for handing off all of the deliverables (App, code repository, documentation) as well as giving the presentation and Q&A. Chefman employee team members are required to be knowledgeable about all the work done for their project. Furthermore, if outside help is utilized, please list their name and a description of their role or contribution to the team. Finally, awards are dispersed to only Chefman employees.

Judging Criteria

Idea (20 pts)

Creativity <i>5 points</i>	<p>5: Multiple highly original ideas in product design, user experience, or AI application.</p> <p>4: One standout original idea or several strong innovations on existing concepts.</p> <p>3: Some innovative twists on established concepts.</p> <p>2: Limited novelty, with only slight variations from existing approaches.</p> <p>1: Reuses standard approaches with little to no originality.</p>
Feasibility <i>5 points</i>	<p>5: Technically sound, realistic, and scalable, with potential challenges proactively and convincingly addressed.</p> <p>4: Appears feasible, but potential challenges are not comprehensively addressed.</p> <p>3: Partially feasible, but has notable concerns or risks that may limit success.</p> <p>2: Limited feasibility, with major obstacles that would be difficult to overcome.</p> <p>1: Not viable in practice due to fundamental technical or practical flaws.</p>
User Impact <i>5 points</i>	<p>5: Multiple highly compelling use cases that clearly solve real problems and achieve user goals.</p> <p>4: Strong use cases with meaningful user benefit, though with moderate breadth or effectiveness.</p> <p>3: Solid use cases that provide value, but limited in scope or niche in appeal.</p> <p>2: Weak use cases with unclear or minimal user benefit.</p> <p>1: No meaningful impact on user needs or goals.</p>

Business Impact <i>5 points</i>	<p>5: Multiple clear and compelling opportunities for achieving both short-term business goals and long-term business value.</p> <p>4: Strong opportunities with meaningful potential, generally aligned with business priorities.</p> <p>3: Some opportunities with potential, but limited in scope, value, or alignment with business priorities.</p> <p>2: Weak opportunities or unclear connection to business impact.</p> <p>1: No discernible business value or relevance.</p>
---	---

Execution (40 pts)

User-Centered Design <i>10 points</i>	<p>9-10: Great care was taken in understanding the target user, with a clear connection to both user and business impact.</p> <p>7-8: Target users are well-considered, though connections to impact are less thorough or not fully demonstrated.</p> <p>5-6: Consideration of target users and goals is present but limited.</p> <p>3-4: The connection to user needs and goals is weak or unclear.</p> <p>1-2: Little to no evidence of user-centered thinking or connection to project goals.</p>
Design Polish & Intuitiveness <i>10 points</i>	<p>9-10: Exceptionally intuitive and polished, feeling like a finished product.</p> <p>7-8: Strong, intuitive, and generally polished.</p> <p>5-6: Functional but uneven. Some aspects of the experience feel intuitive, while others are clunky or incomplete.</p> <p>3-4: Difficult to use or confusing in key areas. Visual polish and flow are lacking.</p> <p>1-2: Highly confusing, incomplete, or unintuitive.</p>

Software Quality <i>10 points</i>	<p>9-10: Robust and stable, feeling nearly production-ready. Comprehensive evidence of testing (including unit tests).</p> <p>7-8: Well-built with few shortcuts or bugs. Some testing is present.</p> <p>5-6: Functional overall but with incomplete or fragile components.</p> <p>3-4: Limited implementation with major gaps or instability.</p> <p>1-2: Minimal or no meaningful software work completed.</p>
App and Recipe Completeness <i>10 points</i>	<p>9-10: The Studio App has a comprehensive set of core features. Recipes are straightforward to eventually integrate into the main CHEF iQ app and appliances.</p> <p>7-8: Most core features are implemented. Recipes can largely be integrable into the CHEF iQ ecosystem with some modifications.</p> <p>5-6: Several core features are implemented. Recipes show integration potential but would need significant additional work to fit into the CHEF iQ ecosystem.</p> <p>3-4: Only a few core features are implemented. Limited consideration has been given to how recipes would integrate into the CHEF iQ ecosystem.</p> <p>1-2: Recipes are not suitable for integration, or adapting them would require extensive rework.</p>

Deliverables (10 pts)

Written Documentation <i>4 points</i>	<p>3-4: Comprehensively covers product goals, UX rationale, and technical decisions. External tools, libraries, and design references are well-documented.</p> <p>1-2: Addresses most key aspects (product, UX, technical), but some areas are underdeveloped or lack clarity. Use of tools and inspiration may be mentioned but not consistently detailed.</p>
---	---

Presentation and Demo <i>4 points</i>	3-4: Polished, engaging and well-prepared , making a compelling case for the project's creativity, feasibility, and impact. A live or recorded demo is included as well as a confident, live Q&A. 1-2: Clear and covers most aspects of the project, but lacks depth or polish. The demo and Q&A are included but may not be fully prepared.
App Deployed and Code Repository Shared <i>2 points</i>	2: App is deployed and accessible to the judges for scoring. Code repository with a README file on how to run the program is included. 1: Substantial support from the team is needed to run the program.

Midpoint Check-in (5 pts)

These points are scored during the Midpoint check in week. Teams schedule a 30-minute time slot with a judge or advisor.

Progress <i>5 points</i>	4-5: Clear evidence of multiple iterations of ideas, designs, and/or code. The team arrives prepared with questions and actively solicits feedback or clarifications. 2-3: The team has progressed into design or coding beyond just initial setup — at least a handful of screens, flows, or features are in progress. 1: The team has only ideated their project or completed minimal setup. 0: The team does not attend the Midpoint Check-in.
--	--

Awards

Best App Award

Placements for the **Best App Award** are determined by the highest overall point totals based on the Judging Criteria.

To be eligible, teams must submit all required deliverables by the competition's conclusion.

- 1st Place: \$20,000 per team
- 2nd Place: \$10,000 per team
- 3rd Place: \$7,000 per team
- 4th-5th Place: \$3,500 per team
- 6th-8th Place: \$2,000 per team