March 31, 2025

Re: HRC0115859

Subject: Request for Reconsideration of Performance Review, For Investigation Into Biased Treatment, & Discriminatory Concerns

Dear Esmaralda,

My name is Narin Anderson, and I have been a committed employee of Boston Scientific for 25 years, currently serving as Principal Packaging Engineer.

I am writing to formally raise serious concerns about biased treatment, potential race and age discrimination, and serious flaws in the recent performance evaluation process that led to a "Improvement Required" rating—the lowest I have ever received during my tenure here. My recent performance review appears to rely heavily on peer feedback, without adequately reflecting the actual outcomes of the projects to which I was assigned or led. I request that this review be reconsidered with a more balanced evaluation of objective results and contributions.

Furthermore, I am raising serious concerns about potential racial and age discrimination bias in promotional decisions. In over 25 years with Boston Scientific, I have received only one promotion despite significant contributions and consistent delivery of high-impact work. In contrast, more than eight Caucasian colleagues with whom I worked in the past have advanced to similar or higher roles within 6–8 years. Most recently, I was not even considered for an interview for a role I was fully qualified for, which was instead filled by a Caucasian colleague.

These issues point to a pattern of potentially biased treatment that warrants formal investigation. I am requesting transparency into the review and promotion processes that have affected my career trajectory.

Background

Over the course of my career, I have consistently contributed to high-impact programs, held leadership roles, and earned multiple patents. I have always upheld strong standards of performance and integrity. The recent performance review and the circumstances surrounding it do not reflect the reality of my contributions.

Performance Review Concerns

1. Biased and Inconsistent Evaluation Process

My manager, Aaron, expanded the peer feedback pool from six individuals I nominated to twelve, without disclosing who the additional evaluators were or whether they had firsthand knowledge of my work. He relied heavily on this feedback, showing me a bar chart of responses without explaining how they were weighted or interpreted. Despite my explanations regarding onboarding into a new

product line and project timeline compression, the evaluation largely ignored this context. Aaron also expressed on multiple occasions that the feedback I received was a poor reflection on him personally raising concern that my rating may have been significantly influenced by perceived impact on his image rather than by objective measures.

2. Overlooked Achievements

The performance review failed to acknowledge several major accomplishments. In particular, my critical contributions with respect to the completion of required workstreams, guidance, and other project input that ultimately led to a successful Ranger 035 Design Freeze—an effort that accelerated multiple market launches—was not reflected in my evaluation. I worked long hours, forfeited 40 hours of earned vacation in 2024, and restarted design work a week before Christmas due to a last-minute decision by the team to change direction. I worked 14-16 hours per day seven days a week for the past 3.5 months so that I could complete critical project deliverables on time with team members from around the globe and maintain the overall program schedule. This effort enabled cross functional peers to build test units and obtain critical data that ultimately allowed the team to obtain "Approval" for a successful Design Freeze recently on March 20, 2025. I also led a Localized Thermal Protection TDP that resulted in a patent filing and contributed to the TheraSphere GBM program. None of these outcomes appear to have been given fair weight.

3. Mischaracterized Collaboration

Feedback about insufficient collaboration overlooked early team decisions to limit engagement with Hemoteq AG. When collaboration gaps were identified, I responded quickly, yet isolated incidents were highlighted while ongoing improvements were disregarded.

Concerns of Racial & Age Discrimination

While I cannot definitively claim discriminatory intent, I am the only Asian serving as a Principal Packaging Engineer within the Packaging Engineering Department in Minnesota and among the most senior employees for all of Boston Scientific in terms of tenure and age. I was not given the opportunity to interview for the Mgr I PI Pkg NPD position, which was awarded to Aaron without a formal or transparent selection process. Taken together, these patterns raise concerns of potential racial and age-based bias in both evaluation and advancement decisions.

Impact

The biased treatment and questionable review process have harmed my professional reputation, caused emotional distress, and disrupted my career trajectory. It has also impacted my compensation and advancement eligibility.

Request for Resolution

I respectfully request a thorough review of these matters, including:

1. A re-evaluation of my performance for the past year
2. A review of the compensation decision in light of my contributions and the company's performance
3. An investigation into the selection process for the recent management promotions.
    a. Request a review of the promotion process and criteria used
    b. What were the specific qualifications sought for the role?
4. Consideration of potential age and race discrimination factors in these decisions

I want to express my deep concern about the ongoing work environment and reporting structure. The prospect of continuing to report to Aaron and Keith after raising these issues is likely to create an uncomfortable and potentially untenable situation for all parties involved. I am worried about potential retaliation and further deterioration of working relationships.

I recognize that this formal request for an investigation will likely turn me into a pariah within the organization once it becomes known. I have given this matter deep thought and considerations. I've also considered the option of not bringing the matter forward.

I have done and sacrificed so much for the business over my 25-year tenure. Now, I simply want to take a small chance and believe that my actions are correct in this instance. I truly feel that my performance rating for the past year is unwarranted. The obstacles and challenges I encountered are normal and I have demonstrated that I was able to overcome them once again.

Given these circumstances, I believe it would be in everyone's best interest to consider potential alternatives that could lead to an amicable resolution. This might include exploring options for a negotiated exit package that fairly reflects my 25 years of service and contributions to the company, including my involvement in the design and development of two best-in-class products (Innova and ELUVIA Drug Eluting Stent) and four patents.

After 25 years of service and dedication to this organization, I remain hopeful that my concerns will be taken seriously and that leadership will ensure that equity, transparency, and accountability are upheld.

Sincerely,

Narin Anderson

Principal Packaging Engineer

Narin.anderson@bsci.com