

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





U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY




B6

FILE:  Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER Date: NOV 05 2010

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:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

Thank you,


Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a CPA 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 as required on the Form ETA 750. Accordingly, the director denied the petition on June 18, 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, counsel asserts the beneficiary's educational credentials, including her state of [REDACTED] CPA certificate were sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the ETA 750 in establishing that the beneficiary possesses the equivalent of a bachelor's degree.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).²

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 or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, are professionals.

A labor certification is an integral part of this petition, but the issuance of a Form ETA 750 does not mandate the approval of the relating petition. To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See also Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

The priority date is the date the Form ETA 750 was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d). The priority date for the instant petition is September 16, 2003. The approved labor certification in the instant case requires a Bachelor's degree

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

² The procedural history of this case is documented in the record and is incorporated herein. Further references to the procedural history will only be made as necessary.

or its equivalency in accounting and two years of experience in the job offered or two years experience in the related occupation of public accounting. Moreover, DOL assigned the occupational code of 160.162-018, accessed as 13-2011.01, accountants, to the proffered position. DOL assigns such codes based on normalized occupational standards. According to the DOL public online database at <http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary>, 13-2011.01³, the DOL description of the position of accountant and the requirements for the position indicate that the position of accountant falls within Job Zone Four. This means that the position requires “considerable preparation.” According to the DOL, two to four years of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience is needed for such an occupation. The DOL assigns a standard vocational preparation (SVP) range of 7 to 8 to the occupation. This means that most of these occupations require a four-year bachelor’s degree, but some do not. The DOL also 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, an accountant position may be analyzed as a professional position or as 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. 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 or a skilled worker. Therefore, USCIS 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.

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.

³ (Accessed August 23, 2010).

For a skilled worker category, a beneficiary must meet the petitioner's requirements as stated on the labor certification in accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(1)(3)(ii)(B), which provides that:

Skilled Workers. If the petition is for a skilled worker, 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, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

The professional category regulation uses 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 January 14, 2002. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977).

The beneficiary set forth her 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), she indicated that she attended the [REDACTED] from June 1991 to June 1999, culminating in the receipt of a Bachelor's of Commerce degree and that she attended the [REDACTED] and possesses a certificate indicating that she passed the final [REDACTED] final examination in 1996. Her field of study is listed on the ETA 750B as cost accounting, from July 1994 to June 1999.⁴ In corroboration of the beneficiary's educational background, the petitioner provided a copy of the beneficiary's three-year Bachelor of Commerce degree and a copy of her September 23, 1996 certificate of passage of the final [REDACTED] examination. Additionally, the beneficiary obtained certification on September 19, 2001, from the state of [REDACTED] recognizing her as a certified public accountant.

The beneficiary possesses a three-year bachelor of commerce degree from the [REDACTED] and completed the [REDACTED] final exam. In determining whether the beneficiary possessed a U.S. bachelor's degree or its equivalence in accounting, as indicated in the request for evidence, we have reviewed the [REDACTED] created by the [REDACTED] according to its website, [REDACTED] is "a nonprofit, voluntary, professional association of more than 10,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals who represent approximately 2,500

⁴ As noted on the [REDACTED] request for evidence, the year 1999 appears to be a typographical error as her diploma indicates that she completed her examination in March 1994.

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 [REDACTED] is “a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials.” [REDACTED] provides a great deal of information about the educational system in [REDACTED]. While it confirms that a bachelor of commerce degree is awarded upon completion of two or three years of tertiary study beyond the Higher Secondary Certificate (or equivalent) and represents attainment of a level of education comparable to two to three years of university study in the United States, it does not suggest that a three-year degree from [REDACTED] may be deemed a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. baccalaureate. However, [REDACTED] confirms that [REDACTED] associate membership upon passing the [REDACTED] final examination represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor’s degree in the United States. The record contains documentary evidence showing the beneficiary in the instant case passed the [REDACTED] final exam and was eligible to receive a certificate of membership as an associate of the [REDACTED] which represents that the beneficiary attained an equivalent to a US bachelor’s degree in accounting. However, the professional regulation contains a degree requirement in the form of an official college or university record. [REDACTED] is not an academic institution that can confer an actual degree with an official college or university record.

As noted in the AAO’s request for evidence, the record contains two evaluations which contained conflicting information. An evaluation, dated February 1, 2000, from the Washington Evaluation Services concluded that the beneficiary’s bachelor’s degree is the U.S. equivalent of a Bachelor of Business Administration degree. The passage of the [REDACTED] final examination was determined to represent a Master of Arts in Accounting.

A second evaluation, dated May 17, 2007, from [REDACTED] was inconsistent with the first in that it now considered the beneficiary’s “combined academic studies are equivalent to a four-year Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with a major in Accounting as awarded by an accredited U.S. university.” In the first evaluation the beneficiary’s Bachelor of Commerce degree was considered standing alone to represent a U.S. four-year degree. This evaluation concluded that “Passing the examinations of the two large Accounting Institutes is equivalent to the Certified Public Accountant qualification of the [REDACTED].”

[REDACTED] It is incumbent on the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. *See Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-592 (BIA 1988).

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, has passed the final [REDACTED] exam and has eligibility for an [REDACTED] associate membership, and a certification as a U.S. CPA in the state of [REDACTED]. 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).

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 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, now 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 unless 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, we also note the 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.

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, as filled in by the petitioner, reflects the following requirements:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 14. | EDUCATION | |
| | Grade School | 6 |
| | High School | 6 |
| | College | 4 |
| | College Degree Required | Bachelor's degree or its equivalency |
| | Major Field of Study | Accounting |

As stated above, the applicant must also have two years of employment experience in the job offered or two years in a related occupation of public accounting. Item 15 reflects other special

requirements that specify that the beneficiary “must have CPA certification. Knowledge of the accounting principles (FASB/SFAS). Knowledge of Federal Forms 990, 990-T and 5500. Knowledge of Accounting Software package and Solomon IV for Windows.”

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, we are 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 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 *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 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. If we were to accept the employer's definition of "or equivalent," instead of the definition DOL uses, we 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.

In this case, 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 a Bachelor’s degree or its equivalence in accounting, and two years of experience in the job offered or a related occupation. The singular degree requirement is not applicable to skilled workers and the petitioner here has stated on the labor certification that it will accept the equivalent of a bachelor’s degree. The regulation governing skilled workers only requires that the beneficiary meet the requirements of the labor certification. As previously discussed, [REDACTED] confirms that [REDACTED] associate membership upon passing the [REDACTED] final examination represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor’s degree in the United States. The record contains documentary evidence showing the beneficiary in the instant case passed the [REDACTED] final exam and was eligible for a certificate of membership as an associate of the [REDACTED]. As counsel points out on appeal, it is additionally noted that the state of [REDACTED] requires an applicant to possess a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent before sitting for the CPA examination. According to its online website, the [REDACTED] Board of Accountancy will consider a degree or coursework earned at a non-accredited institution if the individual’s degree or coursework is evaluated by an academic credentials evaluation firm approved by the [REDACTED] Board. A [REDACTED] CPA examination candidate must possess from one or more accredited institutions or from the National College at least 120 semester hours of education, a baccalaureate or higher degree, and an accounting concentration or equivalent prior to taking any part of the CPA examination.⁵ As noted above, the beneficiary obtained certification from [REDACTED] on September 19, 2001, recognizing her as a certified public accountant.

We additionally find persuasive the recruitment postings provided in response to the AAO’s request for evidence as well as the letter from the petitioner indicating that certain other foreign worker recruitments conducted in 2003 had not distinguished between three and four year degrees when the

candidates possessed other qualifications such as CPA certification. The Notice of Filing specifically stated that candidates could qualify based on a "Bachelor's degree or its equivalency" in Accounting. Here, the petitioner clearly stated on Form ETA 750 that it would accept a bachelor's or an equivalent degree. The petitioner specified in its recruitment that it would accept a "Bachelor's degree or its equivalency." The beneficiary's credentials have been determined to be the equivalent of a bachelor's degree. Therefore, based on the facts in this case, the AAO finds that the beneficiary holds an equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree in accounting and thus, meets the educational requirements specifically set forth on the certified labor certification as a skilled worker in the instant case. This ground of the director's denial is withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, the petitioner sufficiently demonstrated that the beneficiary met the qualifications of the labor certification. 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 met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is sustained.