



not have any available work instructions and needed work instructions constructed.

*D. 5S+1: Probes and Fixtures*

Currently, the fixture and probe storage were not fully utilized. We can establish an organizational system based on the frequency of use and ease of access. The cabinets were used for probes and fixtures that are less commonly used or required a more unique set up requirement. Each CMM station had its own set of probes and had a storage carousel to store their respective probes. However, the stations lacked labeling and organization for all the equipment at the station. The current time it takes for a metrology technician to set up a CMM and run their “in process” set-up is 20 minutes. Using 5S+1 Methodology, the team can reduce the time it takes for them to perform the task and save Paragon Medical money.

IV. DELIVERABLES AND CONCLUSION

*A. Validation of Calibration frequency*

Data about tool wear and number of uses from Unipoint and Omega Cube was needed to use Minitab to conduct a reliability analysis. Every calibration conducted is recorded. The relevant information were the nominal dimensions, actual dimensions, tolerances for each specific tool being inspected and finally a pass or fail based on tolerance specifications of each part. We focused on the “0-80” thread gage, which had the most historical data points in both systems. We collected previous work orders that used the “0-80” Gage. There were ~16,000 uses for the tool with about 5 points of failure due to wear or damaged and chipped threads.

This thread gage required 100% inspection which meant every unit made with this thread gage for inspection was checked. The only thing that the tool use count didn’t contain was the amount of uses for final inspection. Only in process parts were inspected and recorded. But for final inspection they were inspected but the tool use is not recorded. To account for this there are two approaches: (1) remove missing data points and conduct the reliability analysis, (2) fill in missing data with an average of production rate and actual number of days between each missing point. In Minitab, we performed both approaches.

Both approaches show that increasing the tool use count from 250 uses between validations to 500 has about 83% chance of survival for approach 1 and 92% of survival for approach 2. We can reduce the number of calibrations needed between parts and reduce the time spent calibrating each day.

TABLE 1: SURVIVAL PROBABILITIES FOR APPROACH 1

Time	Probability	95.0% Normal CI	
		Lower	Upper
250	0.934950	0.825149	0.981792
500	0.836660	0.666836	0.937048
750	0.748285	0.522537	0.900023
1000	0.672900	0.406521	0.871261

TABLE 2: SURVIVAL PROBABILITIES FOR APPROACH 2  
95.0% Normal CI

Time	Probability	Lower	Upper
250	0.946223	0.877569	0.976875
500	0.922839	0.841753	0.963261
750	0.904925	0.813790	0.952717
1000	0.889896	0.789670	0.944005

It is strongly recommended to continue to perform reliability analysis with the collection of more data points.

*B. Work Instructions*

The updated work instructions for Keyence, OGP, and Hawk machines could improve calibration times and reliability. Lower-level calibration instructions, mitigation measures, images, and set up instructions that reflect Paragon’s current practices were added. The Zeiss work instructions’ first revision was verified. We recommended that the company transition from hard copy work instructions to an electronic database that is easily accessible to operators. The continuous application of 5S should also apply to work instructions. These efforts will guarantee continuous improvement in calibration flow and reliability.

*C. 5S+1: Probes and Fixtures*

While implementing 5S+1, the team standardized the process by minimizing time searching for equipment and decluttered the CMM station. A picture displaying all the contents inside of the storage cabinets was attached on the outside of door. This will help the technician find what they need before opening the door. Additionally, the team added labels to the carousel storages and gave each probe a designated home. This reduces the time it takes for each technician to locate the probes that they need. It also declutters the workstation so that efficient work can be performed. The racks under the CMM station tables stored less frequently used fixtures. A 5S+1 audit sheet was created that allows the metrology team to track their progress, while making abnormalities easily recognizable. The team conducted a 5S+1 Workshop to introduce the concepts of 5S+1 and how to implement in the future.

Finally, a time study was conducted a final time to determine the updated time it takes a technician to execute an “in process” set-up. The updated time it took the technician was 7 minutes, which reduced the original time by 13 minutes. A cost analysis was performed, and it saved the company \$21 per each “in process” set-up.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Special thanks to the Paragon team for sponsoring the project and the support from the faculty: Brad Reinke, Pete Anetsberger, Rudy Bautista, Cecilia, and others. The team would like to also acknowledge the department of Industrial and Systems Engineering for their guidance and support of the project: Dr. Hwang, Dr. Gary Chen, Dr. Nguyen, Dr. Niechen Chen, and Dr. Damodaran.