

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B6



FILE: LIN-05-206-50658 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP 29 2008

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a precision abrasive waterjet systems manufacturer. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a manufacturing engineer (master scheduler), pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(i). As required by statute, a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (Form ETA 750 or labor certification), accompanied the petition. As set forth in the director's September 2, 2005 denial, 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 Bachelor's Degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline. Accordingly, the director denied the petition under the professional category.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed and 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 counsel asserts that the petition was submitted to classify the beneficiary under the skilled worker category, that the petitioner intended to accept a combination of education, training and experience to meet the bachelor's degree requirement, and that the beneficiary's combined education, training, and experience is equivalent to a bachelor's degree and fulfills the requirements for the proffered position as a skilled worker.

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 evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.¹ On appeal, counsel submitted a brief and copies of previously filed documentation pertinent to the beneficiary's qualifications. However, the record does not contain any evidence showing that the petitioner specified on the Form ETA 750 that the minimum academic requirements of a bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline 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 might be met through a combination of lesser degrees and/or quantifiable amount of work experience, the AAO issued a request for evidence (RFE). The record contains a response to

¹ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

the RFE. This office will also examine and consider the evidence submitted in response to the RFE in adjudicating the instant appeal.

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 original Form ETA 750 was accepted on September 5, 2002 and approved on June 1, 2005. The approved labor certification in the instant case requires a “Bachelor’s Degree” in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline. DOL assigned the occupational code of 012.167-042, manufacturing engineer, 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 at <http://online.onetcenter.org/crosswalk/DOT?s=012.167-042&g=Go> (accessed September 3, 2008) and its extensive description of the position and requirements for the position most analogous to manufacturing engineer position, the position falls within Job Zone Four requiring “considerable preparation” for the occupation type closest to general and operations manager 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/17-2112.00#JobZone> (accessed September 3, 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 manufacturing engineer 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.² In this case, the proffered position of manufacturing engineer is one of the occupations defined at section 101(a)(32) of the Act, that is engineers, however, the petitioner filed a Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker, explicitly requesting for classification

² 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.”

under the skilled worker category pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act. Therefore, Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) will examine the petition under the professional and skilled worker categories, the latter of 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.

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.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have the education and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's filing date, which as noted above, is October 31, 2002. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

The beneficiary set forth his credentials on Form ETA-750B. On Part 11 of the Form ETA 750B, eliciting information of the names and addresses of schools, college and universities attended (including trade or vocational training facilities), the beneficiary indicated that he attended Humber College of Applied Arts & Technology in Toronto, Canada in the field of "Manufacturing Engineering" from September 1985 through June 1988, culminating in the receipt of a "Diploma with Honours." The beneficiary did not provide any further information on his educational background on the form. The beneficiary signed the form on August 28, 2002 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 Diploma for completion of the requirements of the Manufacturing Engineering Technician Program, Diploma for completion of the requirements of the Manufacturing Engineering Technician Program with Honours and transcripts for the Fall 1985 term to the Summer Winter 1988 term from Humber College, and an evaluation report dated March 20, 2001 from Alfonso E. Bradoch of Foundation for International Services, Inc. (FIS March 20, 2001 evaluation).

The diploma and transcripts show that the beneficiary took 40 courses in the manufacturing engineering technician program during the almost three years from the Fall 1985 term to the Winter 1988 term and was awarded the diploma for completion of the requirements of the manufacturing engineering technician

program with honors in June 1988 by Humber College of Applied Arts & Technology in Toronto, Canada. A bachelor's degree is generally found to require four years of education. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244, 245 (Comm. 1977). In addition, the submitted FIS March 20, 2001 evaluation stated the following in pertinent part:

Copy of a diploma from Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology in Toronto, Ontario, Canada certifying that [the beneficiary] was awarded this Diploma in the Manufacturing Engineering Technology Program with Honours having fulfilled all the requirements for the Diploma. This document which was dated June of 1988 was signed by the Registrar, the Chairman of the Board and the President and is equivalent to two years of university-level credit from an accredited community college in the United States.

The FIS March 20, 2001 evaluation evaluated the beneficiary's education from Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology in Toronto, Canada as equivalent to two years of university-level credit from an accredited community college in the United States. Therefore, the beneficiary did not hold a Bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent disciplines or a foreign equivalent degree based upon his education only.

However, counsel asserts that the beneficiary possessed the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline prior to the priority date according to the private credential evaluation. The FIS March 20, 2001 evaluation continued that:

Resume listing [the beneficiary's] employment experiences in the field of manufacturing technology from May of 1988 to August of 1989, January of 1990 to December of 1991, and May of 1992 to the present (1 1/2 years) and the responsibilities of each. ...

In summary, it is the judgment of the [FIS] that [the beneficiary] has the equivalent of two years of university-level credit in manufacturing engineering technology from an accredited community college in the United States; and in addition, has through the expert opinion letter from [REDACTED] BSES, MBA, President of NOVA Composites, Inc. as a result of his academic background, professional training and progressively more responsible employment experience, the expertise of a highly qualified Master Schedule/Materials Scheduler consistent with an educational background the equivalent of an individual with a bachelor's degree in mechanical and manufacturing engineering in the United States.

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 H1B petitions, not to immigrant petitions for classification as professional. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5). CIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, CIS is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988).

The regulations define a third preference category professional as a “qualified alien who holds at least a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and who is a member of the professions.” See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2). The record does not contain any evidence that the beneficiary holds a single United States baccalaureate degree or a single foreign equivalent degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline 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 in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline,” 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 a bachelor’s degree. Thus, the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary is qualified for the professional position, and the director’s ground denying the petition under the 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 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(l)(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 a bachelor’s degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline as the minimum educational requirement for the proffered position and the evidence submitted in the record shows that the beneficiary’s only formal education is evidenced with a three-year diploma for completion of the manufacturing engineering technician program from Humber College. Thus, the issues are whether the beneficiary’s three-year diploma can be considered as the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor’s degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline, and if not, whether it is appropriate to consider the beneficiary’s experience in addition to the diploma. We must also consider whether the beneficiary meets the 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.

Madany v. Smith, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

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, *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 bachelor's degree 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. *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.

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:

The Department of Labor ("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 [REDACTED] 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. Michael Chertoff*, CV 06-65-MO (D. Ore. November 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.* at 11-13. 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.* at 14. 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.* at 17, 19. In the instant case, unlike the labor certification in *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, the petitioner's intent regarding educational equivalence is clearly stated.

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:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--|
| 14. | EDUCATION | |
| | Grade School | |
| | High School | |
| | College | 4 [years] |
| | College Degree Required | Bachelor's Degree |
| | Major Field of Study | Manufacturing Eng[inieering] or equiv[alent] dis[cipline] |

The applicant must also possess three (3) years of experience in the job offered or in production planning and scheduling in manufacturing industry.

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).

Once again, we are cognizant of the recent holding in *Grace Korean*, which held that CIS is bound by the employer's definition of "bachelor or equivalent." In reaching this decision, the court concluded that the employer in that case tailored the job requirements to the employee and that DOL would have considered the beneficiary's credentials in evaluating the job requirements listed on the labor certification. As stated above, the reasoning underlying a district judge's decision will be given due consideration when it is properly before the AAO, but the analysis does not have to be followed as a matter of law. *K.S. 20 I&N Dec. at 719*. In this matter, the court's reasoning cannot be followed as it is inconsistent with the actual practice at DOL. The court in *Grace Korean* specifically noted that the skilled worker classification does not require an actual degree.

As discussed above, the role of the DOL in the employment-based immigration process is to make two determinations: (i) that there are not sufficient U.S. workers who are able, willing, qualified and available to do the job in question at the time of application for labor certification and in the place where the alien is to perform the job, and (ii) that the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed U.S. workers. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act. Beyond this, Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any other determinations in the immigrant petition process. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1013. As discussed above, CIS, not DOL, has final authority with regard to determining an alien's qualifications for an immigrant preference status. *K.R.K Irvine*, 699 F.2d at 1009 FN5 (*citing Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1011-13). This authority encompasses the evaluation of the alien's credentials in relation to the minimum requirements for the job, even though a labor certification has been issued by DOL. *Id.*

Specifically, as quoted above, the regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.21(b)(6) requires the employer to “clearly document . . . that all U.S. workers who applied for the position were rejected for lawful job related reasons.” BALCA has held that an employer cannot simply reject a U.S. worker that meets the minimum requirements specified on the Form ETA-750. See *American Café*, 1990 INA 26 (BALCA 1991), *Fritz Garage*, 1988 INA 98 (BALCA 1988), and *Vanguard Jewelry Corp.* 1988 INA 273 (BALCA 1988). Thus, the court’s suggestion in *Grace Korean* that the employer tailored the job requirements to the alien instead of the job offered actually implies that the recruitment was unlawful. If, in fact, DOL is looking at whether the job requirements are unduly restrictive and whether U.S. applicants met the job requirements on the Form ETA 750, instead of whether the alien meets them, it becomes immediately relevant whether DOL considers “B.A. or equivalent” to require a U.S. bachelor degree or a foreign degree that is equivalent to a U.S. bachelor’s degree. We are satisfied that DOL’s interpretation matches our own. In reaching this conclusion, we rely on the reasoning articulated in *Hong Video Technology*, 1998 INA 202 (BALCA 2001). That case involved a labor certification that required a “B.S. or equivalent.” The Certifying Officer questioned this requirement as the correct minimum for the job as the alien did not possess a Bachelor of Science degree. In rebuttal, the employer’s attorney asserted that the beneficiary had the equivalent of a Bachelor of Science degree as demonstrated through a combination of work experience and formal education. The Certifying Officer concluded that “a combination of education and experience to meet educational requirements is unacceptable as it is unfavorable to U.S. workers.” BALCA concluded:

We have held in [REDACTED] et als., 94-INA-465, 94 INA-544, 95-INA-68 (Feb. 2, 1998 (en banc) that where, as here, the alien does not meet the primary job requirements, but only potentially qualifies for the job because the employer has chosen to list alternative job requirements, the employer’s alternative requirements are unlawfully tailored to the alien’s qualifications, in violation of [20 C.F.R.] § 656.21(b)(5), unless the employer has indicated that applicants with any suitable combination of education, training or experience are acceptable. Therefore, the employer’s alternative requirements are unlawfully tailored to the alien’s qualifications, in violation of [20 C.F.R.] § 65[6].21(b)(5).

In as much as Employer’s stated minimum requirement was a “B.S. or equivalent” degree in Electronic Technology or Education Technology and the Alien did not meet that requirement, labor certification was properly denied.

Significantly, when DOL raises the issue of the alien’s qualifications, it is to question whether the Form ETA-750 properly represents the job qualifications for the position offered. DOL is not reaching a decision as to whether the alien is qualified for the job specified on the Form ETA 750, a determination reserved to CIS for the reasons discussed above. Thus, DOL’s certification of an application for labor certification does not bind us in determinations of whether the alien is qualified for the job specified. As quoted above, DOL has conceded as much in an amicus brief filed with a federal court.

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.” *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 Bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline. The petitioner clearly required a bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or related field. It is also noted that the petitioner does not require an equivalent of a bachelor's degree but a bachelor's degree in an equivalent discipline to manufacturing engineering. The labor certification does not further define the degree requirement. Nor does the certified labor certification demonstrate that the petitioner would accept a combination of degrees 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 diplomas, and/or quantifiable amount of work experience.

Furthermore, the AAO's RFE dated July 19, 2007 requested the petitioner to submit evidence showing that the petitioner specified that the minimum academic requirements of a bachelor's degree might be met through a combination of lesser degrees and/or quantifiable amount of work experience in the petitioner's labor market test. The AAO specifically requested evidence demonstrating that the petitioner communicated its express intent about the actual minimum requirements of the proffered position to DOL during the labor certification process. In the response, counsel submits relevant materials pertinent to the recruitment efforts, including advertisements, internal postings, the recruitment result report. All these documents show that the petitioner requires a bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline as the minimum educational requirement for the proffered position. The record does not contain any evidence indicating that the petitioner would accept a combination of lesser diplomas and quantifiable amount of work experience to meet the minimum educational requirement of a bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline. Counsel argues that the petitioner's letter states that it "has always accepted, and will continue to accept, the equivalent combination of education, training, and experience in lieu of an academic degree." However, the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). The non-existence or other unavailability of required evidence creates a presumption of ineligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2)(i). In fact, the declaration dated August 28, 2002 from [REDACTED] as the Human Resources Manager of the petitioner submitted to the DOL as the recruitment result report states in pertinent part that:

Accordingly, it is crucial that the Master Scheduler have the requisite Bachelor's degree in Manufacturing Engineering. ... It is standard practice for the petitioner, and its competitors within the high precision abrasive machining equipment industry, to require a bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or an equivalent discipline as a minimum qualification for the position of Master Scheduler.

The declaration also indicates that the petitioner disqualified sixty-six individuals from seventy-seven applicants responding to its March 10, 2002 advertisement and eighty-one from ninety-eight responding to its May 5, 2002 advertisement because they did not possess the requisite Bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or an equivalent discipline. The AAO does not find that DOL or U.S. workers were on notice that a combination of lesser degrees and work experience as an equivalent would meet the minimum educational requirement of a bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline during the labor certification process. Therefore, the petitioner failed to demonstrate its intent to accept a combination of lesser degrees and work experience as an equivalent of a bachelor's degree in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline 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.* at 11-13. 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 degrees and quantifiable amount of work experience during any stage of the labor certification application process.

As previously discussed, the beneficiary holds a three-year diploma, which is alone evaluated by the FIS March 20, 2001 evaluation submitted by the petitioner that it represents attainment of an equivalent of two years of university-level credit from an accredited community college in the United States. Therefore, the beneficiary's three-year diploma from Humber College cannot be considered as equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate in manufacturing engineering or equivalent discipline. The record does not contain any evidence showing that the beneficiary obtained any other college level education prior to the priority date.

Therefore, the AAO finds that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary met the minimum educational requirements for the proffered position prior to the priority date under the skilled worker category. The petition must be denied.

The AAO thus affirms the director's decision that the preponderance of the evidence does not demonstrate that the beneficiary acquired a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor's degree from the evidence submitted into this record of proceeding and thus the petitioner has not demonstrated that he is qualified for the proffered position as a professional or 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.