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DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and now is before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a value added reseller. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a network administrator (data recovery planner). As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the beneficiary did not satisfy the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification. Specifically, the director determined that the beneficiary did not possess a four-year bachelor’s degree as required on the Form ETA 750. Accordingly, the director denied the petition on March 5, 2007.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary.

On appeal prior counsel asserted that the director erred in not adjudicating this petition under the skilled worker category and that the petitioner intended the language “bachelor’s degree in computer science or equivalent” to include degree equivalent based on education and experience. However, the record did not contain any evidence showing that the beneficiary’s three-year diploma and training certificates are equivalent to a U.S. bachelor’s degree, or that the petitioner specified on the Form ETA 750 that the minimum academic requirements of a bachelor’s degree in computer science might be met through a combination of lesser degrees and/or quantifiable amount of work experience. The labor certification application, as certified, does not demonstrate that the petitioner would accept a combination of degrees that are individually all less than a four-year U.S. bachelor’s degree or its foreign equivalent and/or quantifiable amount of work experience when it oversaw the petitioner’s labor market test. In order to determine whether the instant petition could be considered under the skilled worker category, and whether the petitioner specified on the certified Form ETA 750 that the minimum academic requirements of a bachelor’s degree or equivalent might be met through a combination of lesser degrees and/or quantifiable amount of work experience, the AAO issued a request for evidence (RFE) on January 29, 2008, granting the petitioner 12 weeks to submit additional evidence to support its assertions on appeal. The AAO received the response on April 24, 2008.

The AAO maintains plenary power to review each appeal on a de novo basis. 5 U.S.C. § 557(b) (“On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule.”); see also, Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO’s de novo authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. See, e.g. Dor v. INS, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989). The AAO considers all pertinent

---

While the instant appeal was pending with the AAO, another company filed a new I-140 immigrant petition on behalf of the instant beneficiary as a substituted beneficiary on April 25, 2007 and the petition was approved on October 17, 2007.

After March 28, 2005, the correct form to apply for labor certification is the ETA Form 9089.
evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal and in response to the AAO’s RFE.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

The Form ETA 750 was accepted on May 3, 2004 and certified on September 19, 2006. The certified ETA 750 in the instant case requires four years of college studies, a bachelor’s degree in computer science. DOL assigned the occupational code of 15-1071.00, network and computer systems administrator, the closest type of occupation as the proffered position. DOL’s occupational codes are assigned based on normalized occupational standards. According to DOL’s public online database and its extensive description of the position and requirements for the position most analogous to network administrator position, the position falls within Job Zone Four requiring “considerable preparation” for the occupation type closest to network administrator position. According to DOL, two to four years of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience is needed for such an occupation. DOL assigns a standard vocational preparation (SVP) range of 7-8 to the occupation, which means “[m]ost of these occupations require a four-year bachelor’s degree, but some do not.” See http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary/15-1071.00#JobZone (accessed May 14, 2008). Additionally, DOL states the following concerning the training and overall experience required for these occupations:

A minimum of two to four years of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience is needed for these occupations. For example, an accountant must complete four years of college and work for several years in accounting to be considered qualified. Employees in these occupations usually need several years of work-related experience, on-the-job training, and/or vocational training.

See id.

Therefore, a network and computer systems administrator position could be properly analyzed as a professional or as a skilled worker since the normal occupational requirements do not always require a bachelor’s degree but a minimum of two to four years of work-related experience.3 In this case, the petitioner filed a Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, seeking classification pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Act by checking box e in Part 2 of the I-140 form. The box e is for either a professional

3 A professional occupation is statutorily defined at Section 101(a)(32) of the Act as including but not limited to “architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries.” It is noted that network and computer systems administrator positions are not included in this section.
or a skilled worker. Therefore, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) will examine the petition under the professional and skilled worker categories, which requires a showing that the alien has two years of training or experience and meets the specific education, training, and experience terms of the job offer on the alien labor certification application. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(B).

For the professional category, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) states the following:

If the petition is for a professional, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien holds a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and by evidence that the alien is a member of the professions. Evidence of a baccalaureate degree shall be in the form of an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study. To show that the alien is a member of the professions, the petitioner must submit evidence that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

(Emphasis added.)

The above regulations use a singular description of foreign equivalent degree. Thus, the plain meaning of the regulatory language concerning the professional classification sets forth the requirement that a beneficiary must produce one degree that is determined to be the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree in order to be qualified as a professional for third preference visa category purposes.

For classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) requires the submission of “an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study.” (Emphasis added.) Moreover, it is significant that both the statute, section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, and relevant regulations use the word “degree” in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); Sutton v. United States, 819 F.2d. 1289, 1295 (5th Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress’ narrow requirement in of a “degree” for members of the professions is deliberate. Significantly, in another context, Congress has broadly referenced “the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning.” Section 203(b)(2)(C) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). Thus, the requirement at section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) that an eligible alien both have a baccalaureate “degree” and be a member of the professions reveals that member of the profession must have a degree and that a diploma or certificate from an institution of learning other than a college or university is a potentially similar but distinct type of credential.

In 1991, when the final rule for 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 was published in the Federal Register, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now CIS), responded to criticism that the regulation required an alien to have a bachelor’s degree as a minimum and that the regulation did not allow for the substitution of experience for education. After reviewing section 121 of the Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-649 (1990), and the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference, the Service specifically noted that both the Act and the legislative history indicate that an alien must have at least a bachelor’s degree: “[B]oth the Act and its
legislative history make clear that, in order to qualify as a professional under the third classification or to have experience equating to an advanced degree under the second, \textit{an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree}.” 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991)(emphasis added).

There is no provision in the statute or the regulations that would allow a beneficiary to qualify under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act with anything less than a full baccalaureate degree. More specifically, a three-year diploma will not be considered to be the “foreign equivalent degree” to a United States baccalaureate degree. A United States baccalaureate degree is generally found to require four years of education. \textit{Matter of Shah}, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Reg. Comm. 1977). Where the analysis of the beneficiary’s credentials relies on work experience alone or a combination of multiple lesser degrees, the result is the “equivalent” of a bachelor’s degree rather than a “foreign equivalent degree.” In order to have experience and education equating to a bachelor’s degree under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, the beneficiary must have a single degree that is the “foreign equivalent degree” to a United States baccalaureate degree.

Because the beneficiary does not have a “United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree,” the beneficiary does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act as he does not have the minimum level of education required for the equivalent of a bachelor’s degree.


The beneficiary set forth his credentials on Form ETA-750B. On Part 11, eliciting information of the names and addresses of schools, colleges and universities attended (including trade or vocational training facilities), the beneficiary indicated that he attended Modern High School in Mumbai, India from June 1977 to April 1987, culminating in the receipt of a secondary school certificate (SSC) and Bombay Institute of Technology in Mumbai, India in the field of “Computer Technology” from May 1987 through May 1990, culminating in the receipt of a “Diploma in Computer Technology.” The beneficiary signed the form on April 29, 2004 under a declaration under penalty of perjury that the information was true and correct.

In corroboration of the Form ETA-750B, the petitioner provided the beneficiary’s SSC issued by Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education on June 25, 1987, diploma in computer technology issued by Board of Technical Examinations Maharashtra State on February 8, 1991, leaving certificate issued by Bombay Institute of Technology, transcripts from Maharashtra State Board of Technical Education, and an evaluation from Morningside Evaluation and Consulting.

The petitioner asserts that the beneficiary possessed the equivalent to a U.S. bachelor’s degree in computer information systems according to a private credential evaluation from Morningside Evaluation and Consulting (Morningside), which confirms that the beneficiary’s education is equivalent to three years of college study in the United States, but evaluates the beneficiary’s three-year diploma in computer technology and experience as the equivalent of a bachelor of science degree in computer information systems from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States. Consistent with the evaluation provided, a bachelor degree is generally found to require four years of education. \textit{Matter of Shah}, 17 I&N Dec. 244, 245 (Comm.
1977). The evaluation in the record used the rule to equate three years of experience for one year of education, but that equivalence applies to non-immigrant H-1B petitions, not to immigrant petitions. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5).

The beneficiary possesses a three-year diploma issued by Board of Technical Examinations Maharashtra State. As stated in our January 29, 2008 notice, in determining whether the beneficiary possessed a single U.S. bachelor’s degree or a foreign equivalent degree in computer science, we have also reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). AACRAO, according to its website, http://www.aacrao.org, is “a nonprofit, voluntary, professional association of more than 10,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals who represent approximately 2,500 institutions in more than 30 countries.” Its mission “is to provide professional development, guidelines and voluntary standards to be used by higher education officials regarding the best practices in records management, admissions, enrollment management, administrative information technology and student services.” According to the registration page for EDGE, http://aacraoedge.aacrao.org/register/index.php, EDGE is “a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials.” EDGE provides a great deal of information about the educational system in India. It discusses both Post Secondary Diplomas, for which the entrance requirement is competition of secondary education, and Post Graduate Diplomas, for which the entrance requirement is completion of a two- or three-year baccalaureate. EDGE provides that a Post Secondary Diploma is comparable to one year of university study in the United States, and that a diploma in engineering awarded upon completion of three years of study beyond the Secondary School Certificate (or equivalent) represents attainment of a level of education comparable to up to one year of university study in the United States. EDGE further asserts that a Postgraduate Diploma following a three-year bachelor’s degree “represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor’s degree in the United States.” The “Advice to Author Notes,” however, provide:

Postgraduate Diplomas should be issued by an accredited university or institution approved by the All-India Council for Technical Education (AICTE). Some students complete PGDs over two years on a part-time basis. When examining the Postgraduate Diploma, note the entrance requirement and be careful not to confuse the PGD awarded after the Higher Secondary Certificate with the PGD awarded after the three-year bachelor’s degree.

The record does not contain any evidence showing that the diploma in computer technology program is a bachelor’s degree program. Nor does the record contain evidence showing that any of Board of Technical Examinations Maharashtra State, Bombay Institute of Technology, or Maharashtra State Board of Technical Education has been authorized to grant bachelor’s degrees. The record does not show that the entrance requirement for the beneficiary’s diploma in computer technology program is completion of a two- or three-year baccalaureate. Therefore, the beneficiary’s three-year diploma in computer science from India is not a bachelor’s degree, nor a postgraduate diploma from an accredited university or institution approved by the AICTE. The Form ETA 750 does not specify the minimum academic requirements of four years of college and a bachelor's degree might be met through a combination of lesser degrees and/or quantifiable amount of work experience.
Therefore, the record does not contain any evidence that the beneficiary holds a single United States baccalaureate degree or a single foreign equivalent degree from a college or university to be qualified as a professional for third preference visa category purposes. Because the beneficiary does not have a “United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree” from a college or university, the beneficiary does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(ii) of the Act as he does not have the minimum level of education required for the equivalent of a bachelor’s degree. Thus, the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary is qualified for the proffered professional position, and the director’s ground denying the petition under professional category must be affirmed.

As previously noted, the AAO will also discuss whether the beneficiary would meet the educational requirements set forth on the Form ETA 750 and thus be qualified for the proffered position as if the petitioner had requested the proffered position be analyzed under the skilled worker category.

For the reasons discussed below, we find that decisions by federal circuit courts, which are binding on this office, have upheld our authority to evaluate whether the beneficiary is qualified for the job offered.

While no single degree is required for the skilled worker classification, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(B) provides that a petition for an alien in this classification must be accompanied by evidence that the beneficiary “meets the education, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification.”

The certified Form ETA 750 requires four years of college studies and a bachelor’s degree in computer science as the minimum educational requirements for the proffered position and the evidence submitted in the record shows that the beneficiary’s education includes a three-year diploma in computer technology program at Bombay Institute of Technology and training certificates from private businesses. Thus, the issue is whether it is appropriate to consider the beneficiary’s training certificates and work experience in addition to that diploma as the equivalent to a U.S. bachelor’s degree. We must also consider whether the beneficiary meets the other job requirements of the proffered position as set forth on the labor certification.

**Authority to Evaluate Whether the Alien is Eligible for the Classification Sought**

As noted above, the ETA 750 in this matter is certified by DOL. Thus, at the outset, it is useful to discuss DOL’s role in this process. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act provides:

> In general.-Any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor is inadmissible, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that-

> (I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of an alien described in clause (ii)) and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and
(II) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

According to 20 C.F.R. § 656.1(a), the purpose and scope of the regulations regarding labor certification are as follows:

Under § 212(a)(5)(A) of the Act certain aliens may not obtain a visa for entrance into the United States in order to engage in permanent employment unless the Secretary of Labor has first certified to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that:

(1) There are not sufficient United States workers, who are able, willing, qualified and available at the time of application for a visa and admission into the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform the work, and

(2) The employment of the alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of United States workers similarly employed.

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether or not the alien is qualified for a specific immigrant classification or even the job offered. This fact has not gone unnoticed by Federal Circuit Courts.

There is no doubt that the authority to make preference classification decisions rests with INS. The language of section 204 cannot be read otherwise. See Castaneda-Gonzalez v. INS, 564 F.2d 417, 429 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In turn, DOL has the authority to make the two determinations listed in section 212(a)(14). Id. at 423. The necessary result of these two grants of authority is that section 212(a)(14) determinations are not subject to review by INS absent fraud or willful misrepresentation, but all matters relating to preference classification eligibility not expressly delegated to DOL remain within INS’ authority.

* * *

Given the language of the Act, the totality of the legislative history, and the agencies’ own interpretations of their duties under the Act, we must conclude that Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any determinations other than the two stated in section 212(a)(14). If DOL is to analyze alien qualifications, it is for the purpose of “matching” them with those of corresponding United States workers so that it will then be “in a position to meet the requirement of the law,” namely the section 212(a)(14) determinations.


Authority to Evaluate Whether the Alien is Qualified for the Job Offered
Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the Ninth circuit stated:

[I]t appears that the DOL is responsible only for determining the availability of suitable American workers for a job and the impact of alien employment upon the domestic labor market. It does not appear that the DOL’s role extends to determining if the alien is qualified for the job for which he seeks sixth preference status. That determination appears to be delegated to the INS under section 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), as one of the determinations incident to the INS’s decision whether the alien is entitled to sixth preference status.

*K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1983). The court relied on an amicus brief from DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor ... pursuant to section 212(a)(14) of the ... [Act] ... is binding as to the findings of whether there are able, willing, qualified, and available United States workers for the job offered to the alien, and whether employment of the alien under the terms set by the employer would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers. *The labor certification in no way indicates that the alien offered the certified job opportunity is qualified (or not qualified) to perform the duties of that job.*

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* at 1009. The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, revisited this issue, stating:

DOL must certify that insufficient domestic workers are available to perform the job and that the alien’s performance of the job will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic workers. *Id.* § 212(a)(14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(14). The INS then makes its own determination of the alien’s entitlement to sixth preference status. *Id.* § 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). *See generally K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 9th Cir.1983).

The INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.

*Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984).

We are cognizant of the recent decision in *Grace Korean United Methodist Church v. Michael Chertoff*, CV 04-1849-PK (D. Ore. November 3, 2005), which finds that Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) “does not have the authority or expertise to impose its strained definition of ‘B.A. or equivalent’ on that term as set forth in the labor certification.” In contrast to the broad precedential authority of the case law of a United States circuit court, the AAO is not bound to follow the published decision of a United States district court in matters arising within the same district. *See Matter of K-S*, 20 I&N Dec. 715 (BIA 1993). Although the reasoning underlying a district judge’s decision will be given due consideration when it is properly before the AAO, the analysis does not have to be followed as a matter of law. *Id.* at 719. The court in *Grace Korean
makes no attempt to distinguish its holding from the Circuit Court decisions cited above. Instead, as legal support for its determination, the court cited to a case holding that the United States Postal Service has no expertise or special competence in immigration matters. *Grace Korean United Methodist Church* at *8 (citing *Tovar v. U.S. Postal Service*, 3 F.3d 1271, 1276 (9th Cir. 1993)). On its face, *Tovar* is easily distinguishable from the present matter since CIS, through the authority delegated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, is charged by statute with the enforcement of the United States immigration laws and not with the delivery of mail. See section 103(a) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a).

Additionally, we also note the recent decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Ore. Nov. 30, 2006). In that case, the labor certification application specified an educational requirement of four years of college and a ‘B.S. or foreign equivalent.’ The district court determined that ‘B.S. or foreign equivalent’ relates solely to the alien’s educational background, precluding consideration of the alien’s combined education and work experience. *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, 2006 WL 3491005 at *7-8. Additionally, the court determined that the word ‘equivalent’ in the employer’s educational requirements was ambiguous and that in the context of skilled worker petitions (where there is no statutory educational requirement), deference must be given to the employer’s intent. *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, 2006 WL 3491005 *8. However, in professional and advanced degree professional cases, where the beneficiary is statutorily required to hold a baccalaureate degree, the court determined that CIS properly concluded that a single foreign degree or its equivalent is required. *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, 2006 WL 3491005 at *10-11, *but see Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act. No. 06-2158 (RCL) (D.C. Cir. March 26, 2008). In the instant case, unlike the labor certification in *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, the petitioner’s intent regarding educational equivalence is clearly stated. Specifically, the petitioner in this matter did not indicate on the ETA 750 that it would accept a Bachelor’s “or equivalent.”

The key to determining the job qualifications specified in the labor certification is found on Form ETA-750 Part A. This section of the application for alien labor certification, “Offer of Employment,” describes the terms and conditions of the job offered. It is important that the ETA-750 be read as a whole. The instructions for the Form ETA 750A, item 14, provide:

**Minimum Education, Training, and Experience Required to Perform the Job Duties.** Do not duplicate the time requirements. For example, time required in training should not also be listed in education or experience. Indicate whether months or years are required. Do not include restrictive requirements which are not actual business necessities for performance on the job and which would limit consideration of otherwise qualified U.S. workers.

Regarding the minimum level of education and experience required for the proffered position in this matter, Part A of the labor certification, as filled in by the petitioner, reflects the following requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. EDUCATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade School</td>
<td>8 [years]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4 [years]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>4 [years]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree Required</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Field of Study</td>
<td><strong>Computer</strong> Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The certified ETA 750 also requires two years of experience in the job offered. Item 15 does not reflect any special requirements.

Moreover, to determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, CIS must ascertain whether the alien is, in fact, qualified for the certified job. CIS will not accept a degree equivalency or an unrelated degree when a labor certification plainly and expressly requires a candidate with a specific degree. In evaluating the beneficiary’s qualifications, CIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. CIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. See Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). See also, Madany, 696 F.2d at 1008; K.R.K. Irvine, Inc., 699 F.2d at 1006; Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

Finally, where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by regulation, CIS must examine “the language of the labor certification job requirements” in order to determine what the beneficiary must demonstrate to be found qualified for the position. Madany, 696 F.2d at 1015. The only rational manner by which CIS can be expected to interpret the meaning of terms used to describe the requirements of a job in a labor certification is to “examine the certified job offer exactly as it is completed by the prospective employer.” See Rosedale Linden Park Company v. Smith, 595 F. Supp. 829, 833 (D.D.C. 1984)(emphasis added). CIS’s interpretation of the job’s requirements, as stated on the labor certification must involve “reading and applying the plain language of the [labor certification application form].” Id. at 834 (emphasis added). CIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer’s intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(B) provides that a petition for an alien in this classification “must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and other requirements of the individual labor certification.” As noted previously, the certified Form ETA 750 requires a four-year Bachelor’s degree in computer science. The petitioner clearly required a bachelor’s degree in computer science; the labor certification does not indicate that the petitioner would accept an equivalent to meet the bachelor’s degree requirement. Nor does the certified labor certification demonstrate that the petitioner would accept a combination of degrees or educations that are individually all less than a U.S. bachelor’s degree or its foreign equivalent and/or quantifiable amount of work experience when it oversaw the petitioner’s labor market test. The employer, now the petitioner, did not specify on the Form ETA 750 that the minimum academic requirements of a bachelor’s degree might be met through a combination of lesser degrees, diplomas, and/or quantifiable amount of work experience. It is noted that the Form ETA 750 does not indicate that the employer would accept “equivalent” to a bachelor’s degree as an alternate educational requirement.

In response to the AAO’s RFE dated January 29, 2008, the petitioner submits recruitment efforts conducted related to the relevant labor certification, including the internal posting notice, newspaper advertisements and internet job posting. Some of these recruitment documents require “Bachelors Degree or equivalent in computer science.” However, the petitioner did not amend its educational requirements on the Form ETA
750 by adding the “equivalent” to the bachelor’s degree in computer science requirement when the petitioner filed the labor certification application after six-month recruitment with the bachelor’s degree or equivalent requirements. Nor did the petitioner define the term “equivalent” it used in its recruitment efforts at any stage of labor certification processing. Furthermore, the record does not contain any documents indicating that the employer would accept a combination of lesser degree(s) and quantifiable amount of work experience as an “equivalent” to meet the minimum educational requirement of a bachelor’s degree in computer science. The AAO does not find that US workers were on notice that a combination of lesser degree(s) and work experience as an equivalent would meet the minimum educational requirement of a bachelor’s degree in computer science. Therefore, the petitioner failed to demonstrate its intent to accept a combination of lesser degree(s) and work experience as an equivalent of a bachelor’s degree in computer science on the Form ETA 750 and the relevant recruitment materials.

Additionally, the court in Snapnames.com, Inc. determined that ‘B.S. or foreign equivalent’ relates solely to the alien’s educational background, precluding consideration of the alien’s combined education and work experience. See Snapnames.com, Inc., 2006 WL 3491005 at *7-8. In the instant case, the petitioner failed to submit any documentary evidence showing that the petitioner ever defined or specified that the bachelor’s degree requirement might be met through a combination of education and quantifiable amount of work experience during any stage of the labor certification application processing.

As previously discussed, the beneficiary holds a three-year diploma in computer technology, which alone according to evaluation submitted cannot be deemed as an equivalent of a U.S. bachelor’s degree in computer science. The beneficiary also holds training certificates from private business entities. However, these certificates are not issued by a degree granting institute and no evidence submitted shows that these short-term training courses were given at the college level leading to a bachelor’s degree in computer science.

Therefore, although the AAO concurs with the petitioner’s assertion that the instant petition should also be analyzed under the skilled worker category, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary met the minimum educational requirements for the proffered position under the skilled worker category since the skilled worker position in the instant case requires a bachelor’s degree, the petitioner did not indicate that the minimum educational requirement of a bachelor’s degree in computer science would be meet through a combination of lesser educations and work experience as an equivalent, and the beneficiary did not possess a bachelor’s degree or equivalent in computer science with his educational background. In addition, the beneficiary does not meet the four years of college studies requirement. The beneficiary was required to have a bachelor’s degree in computer science on the Form ETA 750. The petitioner’s actual minimum requirements could have been clarified or changed before the Form ETA 750 was certified by the Department of Labor. Since that was not done, the AAO finds that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary qualified for the proffered position as a skilled worker.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.