

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

B6



FILE: SRC 07 205 51344 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: **MAY 26 2009**

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

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:
[Redacted]

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

John F. Grissom
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is an accounting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an accountant. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750,¹ 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 in accounting.

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.

As set forth in the director's August 28, 2007 denial, the single issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has demonstrated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position by having earned a U.S. bachelor's degree in accounting or a foreign equivalent degree through the completion of four years of college.

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. Further, those decisions, in conjunction with decisions by the Board of Alien Labor Certification Appeals (BALCA), support our interpretation of the phrase "B.A. or equivalent."

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 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.² On appeal, counsel submits a brief; a credentials evaluation dated

¹ After March 28, 2005, the correct form to apply for labor certification is the Form ETA 9089.

² The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-

October 26, 2007 from _____ Professor at Hofstra University;³ a copy of an unpublished AAO decision dated June 14, 2007;⁴ the petitioner's job posting for the proffered position; the petitioner's newspaper advertisements relating to its labor certification application; the DOL's summary report for the position of accountant printed from O*Net Online; examples of job opportunities from other employers' recruitment for the position of accountant; and printouts of court decisions in *Grace Korean United Methodist Church v. Michael Chertoff*, CV 04-1849-PK (D. Ore. November 3, 2005) and *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, CV 06-65-MO (D. Ore. November 30, 2006). Relevant evidence in the record includes a credentials evaluation dated December 19, 2002 from Worldwide Education Evaluators, Inc.;⁵ the beneficiary's Bachelor of Commerce degree issued by Gujarat University in India on March 29, 2001; the beneficiary's Diploma in Computer Science issued by the Royal Institute of Technology in India on September 24, 1999; the beneficiary's transcripts from Gujarat University; a certificate dated October 10, 1980 indicating that the beneficiary was a student at Shree Harivallabhdas Kalidas Commerce College in India during the 1979-1980 academic year; and a credentials evaluation dated July 26, 2007 from _____ Professor at Hofstra University.⁶

290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1).

³ The evaluation states that the beneficiary's degree from Gujarat University is equivalent to "three years of academic studies leading to a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States." The evaluation further states that based on the beneficiary's 24 years of work experience and training, in addition to his coursework at Gujarat University, the beneficiary has "received the equivalent of a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States."

⁴ While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) are binding on all its employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a).

⁵ The evaluation states that the beneficiary's degree from Gujarat University is "equivalent to the completion of three years (six semesters) of study towards a four-year Bachelor's degree in Business Administration and Accounting from a regionally accredited university in the United States." The evaluation further equates the beneficiary's twenty years of work experience, together with his three-year degree, to a "four year Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, Finance, and Accounting."

⁶ The evaluation states that the beneficiary's degree from Gujarat University is equivalent to "three years of academic studies leading to a Bachelor of Business Administration degree, with a concentration in Accounting, from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States." The evaluation further states that based on the beneficiary's 21 years of work experience and training, in addition to his coursework at Gujarat University, the beneficiary has "received the equivalent of a Bachelor of Business Administration degree, with a Concentration in Accounting, from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States." The evaluations of record are not consistent, as two of them equate the beneficiary's degree from Gujarat University to a Bachelor of Business Administration degree, and one equates his degree to a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the

On appeal, counsel asserts that the beneficiary has the foreign equivalent to a degree in accounting. Counsel submits the petitioner's newspaper advertisements and job posting relating to its labor certification application and asserts that a bachelor's degree is not required for the position. Counsel asserts that the DOL assigned the occupational code of 13-2011.01 to the proffered position, and that according to the DOL, a bachelor's degree is common, but not required, for the position of accountant. Counsel restates her request to have the petition considered under the professional and skilled worker classifications, citing *Grace Korean United Methodist Church v. Michael Chertoff*, CV 04-1849-PK (D. Ore. November 3, 2005) and *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, CV 06-65-MO (D. Ore. November 30, 2006). Counsel also provides examples of job offers from other employers' recruitment for the position of accountant where the job requirements include a high school degree or an associate's degree.

The proffered position requires four years of college and a bachelor's degree in accounting or its foreign equivalent. Because of those requirements, the proffered position is for a professional. DOL assigned the occupational code of 13-2011.01, to 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/> (accessed May 15, 2009) and its extensive description of the position and requirements for the position most analogous to the petitioner's proffered position, the position falls within Job Zone Four requiring "considerable preparation" for the occupation type closest to the proffered 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/13-2011.01> (accessed May 15, 2009). 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

record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988). USCIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. See *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791, 795 (Commr. 1988). However, USCIS is ultimately responsible for making the final determination regarding an alien's eligibility for the benefit sought. *Id.* The submission of letters from experts supporting the petition is not presumptive evidence of eligibility; USCIS may evaluate the content of those letters as to whether they support the alien's eligibility. See *id.* at 795. USCIS may even give less weight to an opinion that is not corroborated, in accord with other information, or is in any way questionable. *Id.* at 795; see also *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)). Further, the evaluations used the rule to equate three years of experience for one year of education, but that equivalence applies to nonimmigrant H-1B petitions, not to immigrant petitions. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5).

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.

DOL specifically states that “an accountant must complete four years of college and work for several years in accounting to be considered qualified.” *Id.* **However, counsel suggests that the instant petition should be analyzed under the skilled worker category.** 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. Box (e) is for either a professional or a skilled worker. The director evaluated and denied the petition under the professional category. The AAO will examine the petition under both the professional category and the skilled worker category.

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

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.

While no 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 issue before us is whether the beneficiary meets the job requirements of the proffered job as set forth on the labor certification. The regulations specifically require the submission of such evidence for this classification. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(B) (“the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification”). As noted above, the ETA 750 in this matter is certified by DOL.

The beneficiary possesses a foreign three-year bachelor’s degree from Gujarat University in India, a diploma in computer science from the Royal Institute of Technology in India, and work experience in the proffered position. Thus, the issues are whether the bachelor’s degree from Gujarat University is a foreign degree equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate degree or, if not, whether it is appropriate to consider the beneficiary’s diploma in computer science from the Royal Institute of Technology or

the beneficiary's experience in addition to that degree. We must also consider whether the beneficiary meets the job requirements of the proffered job 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 Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)(A)) 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 (the Service), 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) 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.*

Id. at 1009 (Emphasis added). 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).

The AAO is 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 USCIS "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 USCIS, 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, the AAO also notes 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 USCIS properly concluded that a single foreign degree or its equivalent is required. *Snapnames.com, Inc.* at *17, 19. In the instant case, like the labor certification in *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, the petitioner's intent regarding educational equivalence is ambiguous.

The key to determining the job qualifications 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 reflects the following requirements:

Block 14:

Education

Grade School	blank
High School	blank
College	4
College Degree Required	Accounting or foreign equivalent
Major Field of Study	Accounting

The record of proceeding establishes that the beneficiary obtained a bachelor of commerce degree from Gujarat University in India. In determining whether the beneficiary's diploma from Gujarat University is a foreign equivalent degree, we have reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by AACRAO. AACRAO, according to its website, 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." *See id.*

EDGE provides a great deal of information about the educational system in India. EDGE asserts that a bachelor of commerce degree in India "represents attainment of a level of education comparable to two to three years of university study in the United States." *See* <http://aacraoedge.aacrao.org/credentialsAdvice.php?countryId=99&credentialID=128> (accessed May 15, 2009).

Moreover, to determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, USCIS must ascertain whether the alien is, in fact, qualified for the certified job. USCIS 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, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS 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, the AAO is cognizant of the recent holding in *Grace Korean*, which held that USCIS 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. Regardless, that decision is easily distinguished because it involved a lesser classification, skilled workers as defined in section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act. 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, USCIS, 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 USCIS. In reaching this conclusion, the AAO relies 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 *Francis Kellogg, 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 chose 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 USCIS for the reasons discussed above. Thus, DOL's certification of an application for labor certification does not bind USCIS 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. If the AAO were to accept the employer's definition of "or equivalent," instead of the definition DOL uses, the AAO would allow the employer to "unlawfully" tailor the job requirements to the alien's credentials after DOL has already made a determination on this issue based on its own definitions. We would also undermine the labor certification process. Specifically, the employer could have lawfully excluded a U.S. applicant that possesses experience and education "equivalent" to a degree at the recruitment stage as represented to DOL.

Finally, where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by professional regulation, USCIS must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the petition beneficiary must demonstrate to be found qualified for the position. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. The only rational manner by which USCIS 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). USCIS'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). USCIS 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.

While the AAO does not lightly reject the reasoning of a District Court, it remains that the *Grace Korean* and *Snaphames* decisions are not binding on the AAO, run counter to Circuit Court decisions that are binding on the AAO, and are inconsistent with the actual labor certification process before DOL. Thus, the AAO will maintain its consistent policy in this area of interpreting "or equivalent" as meaning a foreign equivalent degree. In addition, because the petitioner listed "4" as the required number of years of college education, there is nothing in the record to support counsel's assertion that the petitioner would accept a three year degree instead.

In this case, counsel argues that the instant petition contains a position that qualifies in the skilled worker category. 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 four years of college studies and a bachelor’s degree or foreign equivalent in accounting. The certified labor certification does not define “foreign equivalent.” Additionally, the petitioner’s newspaper advertisements and job posting for the proffered position do not define “foreign equivalent.” Thus, while the labor certification in this case permits the foreign equivalent to a U.S. bachelor’s degree, it does not state how the equivalency may be achieved. The petitioner has not clearly demonstrated that U.S. workers without bachelor’s degrees were in fact put on notice that they were eligible to apply for the proffered position, despite the stated requirements of the Form ETA 750, and that the petitioner did not in fact exclude U.S. workers with qualifications similar to those of the beneficiary from applying for and filling the position.⁷ Therefore, the AAO finds that the beneficiary does not meet the educational requirements specifically set forth on the certified labor certification in the instant case.

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.

⁷ Under DOL’s regulations, it is the responsibility of USCIS to ensure that the labor market test was *in fact* carried out in accordance with applicable law. See 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(d).