

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

86



FILE: [Redacted] Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

Date: FEB 11 2011

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:



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 Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal is sustained, and the petition is approved.

The petitioner is a public school system. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a teacher. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750,¹ Application for Alien Employment Certification approved by the Department of Labor (the DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary possessed a United States baccalaureate degree or foreign equivalent degree.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). 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. The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.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 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.

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 Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). The priority date of the petition is January 25, 2005, which is the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).³ The Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) was filed on August 17, 2007.

¹ After March 28, 2005, the correct form to apply for labor certification is the ETA Form 9089. *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 77325, 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004).

² The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1).

³ If the petition is approved, the priority date is also used in conjunction with the Visa Bulletin issued by the Department of State to determine when a beneficiary can apply for adjustment of status or for an immigrant visa abroad. Thus, the importance of reviewing the *bona fides* of a job opportunity as of the priority date is clear.

The job qualifications for the certified position of teacher are found on Form ETA 750 Part A. The job duties (teach classes, present lectures, and conduct workshops in mathematics) are described in section 13 of the Form ETA 750.

The minimum education, training, experience and skills required to perform the duties of the offered position are set forth at Part A of the labor certification and reflects the following requirements:

Block 14:

Education (number of years)

Grade school	Blank
High school	Blank
College	4
College Degree Required	Bachelor
Major Field of Study	Any relevant field

Experience:

Job Offered	Blank
(or)	
Related Occupation	Blank

Block 15:

Other Special Requirements	Master's Degree required for permanent certification Provisional Certification requires: 21 credits in education 30 credits in subject area
----------------------------	--

As set forth above, the proffered position requires 4 years of college culminating in a bachelor's degree. For permanent certification as a teacher, the position requires a master's degree. However, as the master's degree requirement is listed in Block 15 and is restricted to "permanent certification," this appears to be a requirement associated with teacher tenure and not with the permanence of the job offer as required by 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(c)(10). All evidence in the record indicates that a bachelor's degree is the minimum educational requirement for the position. Regardless, it appears more likely than not that the beneficiary has earned the foreign equivalent of a U.S. master's degree. *See infra.*

On Part B of the labor certification, signed by the beneficiary, the beneficiary indicated that she earned a bachelors of science from Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, in psychology and mathematics in 1977; a masters in education from the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and

Tobago, in 1983; and a masters of science in social psychology from the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago, in 1989.

However, the petitioner submitted no evidence establishing that beneficiary had earned these degrees. Counsel only submitted evidence of the beneficiary's certification as a teacher from the New York State Education Department. Accordingly, the director denied the petition on May 27, 2008.

On appeal, counsel argues that, because the beneficiary's degrees are a prerequisite to the teacher certification, evidence of certification establishes that she has earned the necessary degrees. However, once again, counsel failed to submit copies of any diplomas, transcripts, or other evidence establishing that the beneficiary earned any of the degrees listed in the Form ETA 750.

On November 17, 2010, the AAO sent a Request for Evidence (RFE). Once again, the petitioner was requested to submit copies of degrees and/or official transcripts establishing that the beneficiary possessed a bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent degree as of the priority date.

On December 29, 2010, counsel responded to the AAO's RFE. Counsel submitted:

- A copy of the beneficiary's 1977 Bachelor of Science degree and transcripts from Concordia University, Montreal, Canada;
- A copy of the beneficiary's 1993 Master of Education degree from the University of the West Indies;
- A copy of the beneficiary's transcript from the University of the West Indies indicating she was awarded a master's degree in sociology in 1988.
- A December 20, 2010 evaluation of the beneficiary's credentials from World Education Services. The evaluation concludes that the beneficiary has earned the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in psychology with a specialization in mathematics; a U.S. master's degree in sociology; and a U.S. master's degree in education.

In considering the beneficiary's credentials, the AAO has reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).⁴ 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

⁴ In *Confluence Intern., Inc. v. Holder*, 2009 WL 825793 (D.Minn. March 27, 2009), the District Court in Minnesota determined that the AAO provided a rational explanation for its reliance on information provided by AACRAO to support its decision.

resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials." Authors for EDGE are not merely expressing their personal opinions. Rather, they must work with a publication consultant and a Council Liaison with AACRAO's National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials. "An Author's Guide to Creating AACRAO International Publications" 5-6 (First ed. 2005), available for download at www.aacrao.org/publications/guide_to_creating_international_publications.pdf. If placement recommendations are included, the Council Liaison works with the author to give feedback and the publication is subject to final review by the entire Council. *Id.* at 11-12.

EDGE states that the beneficiary's Canadian degree represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor's degree in the United States. EDGE also states that a Trinidadian Master's of Education is comparable to a master's degree in the United States. Finally, EDGE states that a Trinidadian Master's of Science is comparable to a master's degree in the United States.

The proffered position is for a teacher. Thus, it falls under section 101(a)(32) of the Act and is statutorily prescribed as a professional occupation. Additionally, part A of the Form ETA 750 indicates that the DOL assigned the occupational code of 25-2021.00 with accompanying job title "teacher, elementary school," to the proffered position.⁵ The DOL's occupational codes are assigned based on normalized occupational standards. According to the DOL's public online database at <http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary/25-2021.00>, and its description of the position and requirements for the position most analogous to the petitioner's proffered position, the position falls within Job Zone Four.⁶

According to the DOL, two to four years of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience are needed for Job Zone 4 occupations. The DOL assigns a standard vocational preparation (SVP) of 7 to Job Zone 4 occupations, 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/25-2021.00> (accessed January 28, 2011). Additionally, the 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.

⁵ Prior to O*NET, the DOL used the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) occupational classification system. The O*NET website contains a crosswalk that translates DOT codes into SOC codes. *See* <http://online.onetcenter.org/crosswalk/DOT>. Here, the DOL assigned the offered position the DOT code 092.227-010. Using the O*NET crosswalk, this translates to SOC code 25-2021.00.

⁶ According to O*NET, most of the occupations in Job Zone Four require a four-year bachelor's degree. <http://online.onetcenter.org/help/online/zones> (accessed January 28, 2011).

Employees in these occupations usually need several years of work-related experience, on-the-job training, and/or vocational training.

See id.

The position requires four years of college culminating in a bachelor's degree, which is the minimum required by the regulatory guidance for professional positions found at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C). Thus, combined with its statutory definition and the DOL's classification and assignment of educational and experiential requirements for the occupation, the certified position must be considered as a professional occupation.

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 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.

Initially, however, we will provide an explanation of the general process of procuring an employment-based immigrant visa and the roles and respective authority of both agencies involved.

As noted above, the Form ETA 750 in this matter is certified by the DOL. Thus, at the outset, it is useful to discuss the 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.

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to the DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether the position and the alien are qualified for a specific immigrant classification. 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).⁷ *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).

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 the DOL that stated the following:

⁷ Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A) as set forth above.

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).

Therefore, it is the DOL's responsibility to certify the terms of the labor certification, but it is the responsibility of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine if the petition and the alien beneficiary are eligible for the classification sought. For classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) requires that the alien had a U.S. baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and be a member of the professions. Additionally, the regulation requires the submission of "an official *college or university* record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study." (Emphasis added.)

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).

Moreover, it is significant that both the statute, section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, and relevant regulations use the word "degree" in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. *Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana*, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); *Sutton v. United States*, 819 F.2d. 1289m 1295 (5th Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress' narrow requirement in of a "degree" for members of the professions is deliberate. Significantly, in another context, Congress has broadly referenced "the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning." Section 203(b)(2)(C) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). Thus, the requirement at section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) that an eligible alien both have a baccalaureate "degree" and be a member of the professions reveals that a member of the professions must have a *degree* and that a diploma or certificate from an institution of learning other than a college or university is a potentially similar but distinct type of credential. Thus, even if we did not require "a" degree that is the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree, we would not consider education earned at an institution other than a college or university.

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 a 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 single-source "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.

Therefore, because it has now been established that the beneficiary does have a foreign equivalent degree from a college or university in the required field of study listed on the certified labor certification, the beneficiary does qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act as she does have the minimum level of education required for the equivalent of a bachelor's degree.

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. The petition is approved.