From:	Anderson, Narin
To:	Mirviss, Jeff (he/him/his); Mahoney, Mike
Subject:	Formal Request for Performance Re-Evaluation & Investigation
Date:	Wednesday, May 7, 2025 11:55:00 PM
Attachments:	BSC PI Pkg NPD - Formal Complaints_05-07-2025.pdf BSC PI Pkg NPD - Formal Complaintss_Exhibits A thru L.pdf

---

Dear Jeff and Mike,

My name is Narin Anderson, and I have proudly dedicated 25 years of service to Boston Scientific. I currently serve as a Principal Packaging Engineer on the Maple Grove campus. My first eight years with the organization were as a Senior R&D Engineer, and the last 17 years have been serving New Product Development teams for the PI Division, representing Packaging as a core team member for various commercial programs.

Throughout my career, I have been committed to delivering impactful results, driving innovation, and exemplifying our company's values. I am writing to you with deep concerns about potential biases in the evaluation and promotion processes within the Packaging Engineering department in Minnesota. Despite my efforts to resolve these issues through HR—via People Services and Employee Relations—I have found their responses to be dismissive and a suggestion for better alignment with my Manager. Given your demanding priorities, I understand the weight of escalating this matter to you both.

I am disappointed in being forced into this situation…torn between not acting and accepting the status quo which I strongly disagree with and acting yet knowing the full implications of my actions along with the recognition that my future within the organization is likely terminal as this matter reaches your attention. After deep consideration, I have decided to accept all the consequences that may come.

Key Concerns

1. *Biased Performance Evaluation Process*

My most recent performance review—the first "Improvements Required" rating in my 25-year tenure—does not accurately reflect the outcomes of my contributions.
I strongly disagree with the fact that my performance review was based entirely on subjective peer feedback without consideration for deliverables or outcomes. Furthermore, my manager unilaterally expanded the feedback pool from my recommended six peers to twelve individuals without ensuring their direct familiarity with my work, nor did he provide clarity on how this feedback was weighted or validated.

My performance challenges—such as onboarding into a new product line and compressed project timelines—were not considered to provide for the proper context of any given situation due to the complexity of my work.

Finally, my manager's repeated comments in my 1:1 meetings that negative feedback reflected poorly on him suggests bias where my rating was influenced by his personal image rather than actual performance. This suggests the evaluation was not based on a fair assessment of my contributions.

In a 1:1 meeting on April 10th, I asked how outcomes and deliverables were factored into the rating and no reasonable response was given other than a change of subject to team dynamics. What is also upsetting was that my position about this matter was fabricated and formalized in a PIP meeting minutes for documentation to fit a pre-determined narrative of the fact I am on a PIP with an "Improvements Required" rating rather than accurately documenting the discussion. Actions that misrepresent an employee's position in which they feel strongly about call into question the overall fairness and credibility of the evaluation process. This raises serious concerns about the integrity of our performance management practices.

We are a Medical Device company and when a Manager act like this toward his employee, it puts the organization on a slippery slope should others deem the behavior to be acceptable. What does this action convey about our integrity and reputation by stakeholders, customers, and patients alike?

This type of conduct has the potential to undermine stakeholders, customer, and patient trust in our organization. Trust that takes decades to build can be easily ripped away. It is critical that performance reviews be grounded in objective, measurable criteria to ensure fair treatment of all employees. The apparent disregard for facts and documentation in this case is highly problematic and warrants a thorough investigation.

2. *Overlooked Achievements*

Several major contributions were not appropriately recognized in my evaluation, including:

Ranger 035 PDP Program Contributions: I led critical Packaging Design and Development workstreams, working up to 16-hour days over 3.5 months continuously in addition to forfeiting 40 hours of earned vacation in 2024 to support last-minute design

changes. My efforts contributed to a successful Design Freeze on March 20, 2025, accelerating multiple market launches.

Patents Filed: I filed two patents—Localized Thermal Protection and a QR-based multilingual chatbot for packaging—with a combined estimated economic value exceeding $200 million. Once implemented strategically and executed effectively, both of these patents will create enduring and meaningful value for Boston Scientific for years to come.

TheraSphere GBM HFA Program: I provided essential contributions through guidance, DV protocol creation, test unit builds, and more.

These accomplishments demonstrate measurable business impact yet failed to influence my performance rating.

3. *Potential Racial and Age Discrimination*

As the only Asian Principal Packaging Engineer in our Minnesota facility, I am deeply concerned that racial and age-related biases may have influenced my performance evaluation and career progression. Some concerning patterns include:

- Over my 25-year tenure, I have received just one promotion (from Senior Engineer to Principal Engineer after 18 years), whereas at least eight Caucasian colleagues achieved comparable or higher roles within 6-8 years.
- I was excluded from consideration for the Mgr I PI Pkg NPD role—filled without a transparent selection process—despite being qualified and playing a significant role in strategy development.
- Several months ago, I couldn't even get an opportunity to interview for a Mgr I Pkg Acquisition because the hiring Manager was looking for people management exposure. That was despite me conveying I have the necessary requirements and experience. He also used to be my former Manager when I was working on the Innova Packaging Redesign Project.

Impact on My Career and Well-Being

The biased review process and lack of advancement opportunities have caused:

- Damage to my professional reputation and career trajectory.
- Limited compensation growth and missed advancement opportunities, despite my

impactful contributions.

- Significant emotional distress with lasting impacts on my morale.
    - Being placed on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) that did nothing but added stress to the existing demands of my accelerated project.
    - Getting an "Improvements Required" rating 14 days before my project design freeze yet recognizing the need to remain focused on my work, knowing the success of the program is important to the business, and my team.
    - It's difficult to articulate how I felt working in Building3 at 9:30 PM on a Saturday night, completing final confirmation builds just a few days before design freeze, with the 'Improvements Required' rating still fresh in my mind.
    - What's worse was that while I felt that emotion, remembering being the only person in Building3 on Christmas Eve, Christmas, New Years Eve, and New Years putting together and packaging new test units trying to make the most of the time I had to accommodate a late change in team decision and minimize disruption to the overall program.

Requests for Resolution

To address these concerns, I respectfully seek your leadership in initiating the following actions:

- *Re-evaluation of my recent performance review*: A fair assessment of my contributions, with a focus on objective accomplishments and transparent criteria.
- *Review of Compensation Decisions*: Alignment of my compensation with the impact of my work and its contributions to Boston Scientific's success.
- *Investigation into Promotion Processes*:
    - A review of the recent selection processes for management roles, ensuring fairness and transparency.
    - Consideration of racial and age-related bias in promotions, including an audit of advancement patterns in Packaging Engineering in Minnesota.

I have been a loyal and dedicated employee to Boston Scientific for the last 25 years of my professional life, consistently delivering high-impact work and upholding the company's values espoused by leadership. I remain hopeful that leadership will take these concerns seriously and find an acceptable resolution to these real concerns,

keeping the matter private without the need for further escalation into public discourse.

Respectfully,

Narin Anderson
Principal Engineer
Boston Scientific
Packaging Engineering
narin.anderson@bsci.com
651-581-9203
Three Scimed Place
MS C120
Maple Groe, MN 55311
www.bostonscientific.com

