

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**

B6

DATE: **APR 05 2012** OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

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:

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. 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 \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you

Elizabeth McCormack

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner describes itself as a computer consulting and software development company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a database administrator. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A).

The petition is accompanied by a Form ETA 750, Application for Alien Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition, which is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing, is November 25, 2002. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the beneficiary did not possess a U.S. bachelor's degree as required by the terms of the labor certification and did not qualify for classification as a professional.

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 conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.¹

At the outset, it is important to discuss the respective roles of the DOL and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) in the employment-based immigrant visa process. As noted above, the labor certification in this matter is certified by the DOL. The DOL's role in this process is set forth at section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, which provides:

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

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

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 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).² *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.

² Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A).

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:

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 determine whether there are qualified U.S. workers available to perform the offered position, and whether the employment of the beneficiary will adversely affect similarly employed U.S. workers. It is the responsibility of USCIS to determine if the beneficiary qualifies for the offered position, and whether the offered position and beneficiary are eligible for the requested employment-based immigrant visa classification.

In the instant case, the petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a professional or skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A).³ The AAO will first consider whether the petition may be approved in the professional classification.

³ Employment-based immigrant visa petitions are filed on Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker. The petitioner indicates the requested classification by checking a box on the Form I-140. The Form I-140 version in effect when this petition was filed did not have separate boxes for the professional and skilled worker classifications. In the instant case, the petitioner selected Part 2, Box e of Form I-140 for a professional or skilled worker. The petitioner

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), grants preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) states, in part:

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.

Section 101(a)(32) of the Act defines the term “profession” to include, but is not limited to, “architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries.” If the offered position is not statutorily defined as a profession, “the petitioner must submit evidence showing that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.” 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C).

In addition, the job offer portion of the labor certification underlying a petition for a professional “must demonstrate that the job requires the minimum of a baccalaureate degree.” 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(i)

The beneficiary must also meet all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification by the priority date of the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See Matter of Wing’s Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977); *see also Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

Therefore, a petition for a professional must establish that the occupation of the offered position is listed as a profession at section 101(a)(32) of the Act or requires a bachelor’s degree as a minimum for entry; the beneficiary possesses a U.S. bachelor’s degree or foreign equivalent degree from a college or university; the job offer portion of the labor certification requires at least a bachelor’s degree or foreign equivalent degree; and the beneficiary meets all of the requirements of the labor certification.

It is noted that the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) uses a singular description of the degree required for classification as a professional. In 1991, when the final rule for 8 C.F.R. §

indicates that the petition should be approved under either the skilled worker or professional classification. After reviewing the minimum requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification and the standard requirements of the occupational classification assigned to the offered position by the DOL, the AAO will consider the petition under both the professional and skilled worker categories.

204.5 was published in the Federal Register, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now USCIS or 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).

It is significant that both section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act and the relevant regulations use the word "degree" in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. *Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana*, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); *Sutton v. United States*, 819 F.2d. 1289, 1295 (5th Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress' requirement of a single "degree" for members of the professions is deliberate.

The regulation also 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." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) (emphasis added). 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) of the Act (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). However, for the professional category, it is clear that the degree must be from a college or university.

In *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 30, 2006), the court held that, in professional and advanced degree professional cases, where the beneficiary is statutorily required to hold a baccalaureate degree, USCIS properly concluded that a single foreign degree or its equivalent is required. *See also Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act No. 06-2158 (D.D.C. Mar. 26, 2008)(for professional classification, USCIS regulations require the beneficiary to possess a single four-year U.S. bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent degree).

Thus, the plain meaning of the Act and the regulations is that the beneficiary of a petition for a professional must possess a degree from a college or university that is at least a U.S. baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree.

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the beneficiary has the following education:

Ravishankar University, Raipur (M.P.), India	Commerce	July 1981	June 1984	Bachelor of Commerce
National Institute of Information Technology, New Delhi, India	Computer Software & Applications	April 1985	May 1986	Post Graduate Diploma

The record contains the following as evidence of the beneficiary's qualifications:

- A copy of the beneficiary's [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] from Ravishankar University;
- A letter dated May 15, 1986 from [REDACTED] New Delhi, India, certifying that the beneficiary has completed a one-year post-graduate course in Computer Software and Applications;
- A copy of an evaluation of the beneficiary's educational credentials prepared by [REDACTED] and signed by [REDACTED] Evaluator, on January 21, 2007;
- A copy of an evaluation of the beneficiary's educational credentials prepared and signed on January 21, 2007 by [REDACTED];
- A copy of an evaluation of the beneficiary's educational credentials prepared and signed by [REDACTED] on December 11, 2000; and
- Copies of various articles, studies, and journals describing various methods on converting foreign school credits to U.S. institutions.

The petitioner relies on the beneficiary's three-year bachelor's degree from Ravishankar University as being equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree. A three-year bachelor's degree will generally not be considered to be a "foreign equivalent degree" to a U.S. baccalaureate. See *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Reg. Comm. 1977). Further, the petitioner states that the beneficiary has a post graduate degree (PGD) from [REDACTED] (NIIT), New Delhi, India. NIIT is not accredited by an Indian governmental agency. Where the analysis of the beneficiary's credentials relies on a combination of lesser degrees and/or work experience, the result is the "equivalent" of a bachelor's degree rather than a full U.S. baccalaureate or foreign equivalent degree required for classification as a professional.

Upon review of the evidence submitted, the director determined that the beneficiary only completed a three-year university program, and therefore, his B. Comm. degree from Ravishankar University was not equivalent to a four-year U.S. bachelor's degree. The director also refused to accept the beneficiary's post graduate degree (PGD) from NIIT, New Delhi, India, since NIIT is not accredited by an Indian governmental agency.

The evaluations from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] conclude that the beneficiary completed 120 credits. [REDACTED] awards 10.91 credits for each course. She concludes that the beneficiary achieved 120 “contact hours using the Carnegie Unit.” [REDACTED] does not explain how she determined that each individual course was worth 10.91 credits. Specifically, the beneficiary’s transcript does not provide any information as to classroom hours or credits.

[REDACTED] goes on at length about Carnegie Units and Indian degrees in general, concluding that the beneficiary’s three-year degree is equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate but makes no attempt to assign credits for individual courses. [REDACTED]’s credibility is seriously diminished as he completely distorts an article by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Specifically, [REDACTED] asserts that this article concludes that because the United States is willing to consider three-year degrees from Israel and the European Union, “Indian bachelor degree-holders should be provided the same opportunity to pursue graduate education in the U.S.” While this is the conclusion of the article, the specific means by which Indian bachelor degree holders might pursue graduate education in the United States provided in the discussion portion of the article in no way suggests that Indian three-year degrees are, in general, comparable to a U.S. baccalaureate. Specifically, the article proposes accepting a first class honors three-year degree *following* a secondary degree from a CBSE or CISCE program *or* a three-year degree *plus* a post graduate diploma from an institution that is accredited or recognized by the NAAC and/or AICTE. The record contains no evidence that the beneficiary in this matter received his secondary degree from a CBSE or CISCE program. Finally, the record lacks evidence that the beneficiary completed a post-graduate degree from an approved or accredited Indian University. Thus, [REDACTED]’s reliance on this article is disingenuous.

[REDACTED]’s reliance on *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Ore. Nov. 30, 2006) is equally misplaced. In that case, the alien not only had a credential beyond a three-year degree, the judge determined that even with that extra credential, the alien was only eligible as a skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Act, and *not* as either a professional or an advanced degree professional pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Act. *Id.*

Ultimately, the record contains no evidence that the Carnegie Unit is a useful way to evaluate Indian degrees. The petitioner has submitted materials about the unit posted at “Wikipedia.” Online content from “Wikipedia” is subject to the following general disclaimer:

⁴ [REDACTED] indicates that she has a Master’s degree from the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology and a doctorate from Ecole Superieure Robert de Sorbon but does not indicate the field in which she obtained her doctorate. According to its website, www.sorbon.fr/index1.html, Ecole Superieure Robert de Sorbon awards degrees based on past experience.

⁵ [REDACTED] indicates he has a “canonical diploma of Sacrae Theologiae Professor” from St. David’s Oecumenical Institute of Divinity, which he equates to a Doctorate of Divinity. We were unable to find any reference to this institution on the Internet.

Wikipedia is an online open-content collaborative encyclopedia, that is, a voluntary association of individuals and groups working to develop a common resource of human knowledge. The structure of the project allows anyone with an Internet connection to alter its content. Please be advised that nothing found here has necessarily been reviewed by people with the expertise required to provide you with complete, accurate or reliable information.

See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:General_disclaimer, accessed on April 1, 2012. Reliance on *Wikipedia* is not favored by federal courts. See *Badasa v. Mukasey*, 540 F. 3d 909 (8th Cir. 2008). Moreover, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the use of this system produces consistent results, as would be expected of a workable system.

The Carnegie Unit was adopted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the early 1900s as a measure of the amount of classroom time that a high school student studied a subject.⁶ For example, 120 hours of classroom time was determined to be equal to one "unit" of high school credit, and 14 "units" were deemed to constitute the minimum amount of classroom time equivalent to four years of high school.⁷ This unit system was adopted at a time when high schools lacked uniformity in the courses they taught and the number of hours students spent in class. The Carnegie Unit does not apply to higher education.⁸

The record fails to provide peer-reviewed material confirming that assigning credits by lecture hour is applicable to the Indian tertiary education system. For example, if the ratio of classroom and outside study in the Indian system is different than the U.S. system, which presumes two hours of individual study time for each classroom hour, applying the U.S. credit system to Indian classroom hours would be meaningless. [REDACTED] The University of Texas at Austin, "Assigning Undergraduate Transfer Credit: It's Only an Arithmetical Exercise" at 12, available at http://handouts.aacrao.org/am07/finished/F0345p_M_Donahue.pdf, accessed April 1, 2012 and incorporated into the record of proceedings, provides that the Indian system is not based on credits, but is exam based. *Id.* at 11. Thus, transfer credits from India are derived from the number of exams. *Id.* at 12. Specifically, this publication states that, in India, six exams at year's end multiplied by five equals 30 hours. *Id.*

[REDACTED] also relies on an article he coauthored with [REDACTED]. The record contains no evidence that this article was published in a peer-reviewed publication or anywhere other than the Internet. The article includes British colleges that accept three-year degrees for admission to graduate school but concedes that "a number of other universities" would not accept three-year degrees for admission to graduate school. Similarly, the article lists some U.S. universities that

⁶ The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was founded in 1905 as an independent policy and research center whose motivation is "improving teaching and learning." See <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/about-us/about-carnegie> (accessed November 30, 2011).

⁷ <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/faqs> (accessed November 30, 2011).

⁸ See <http://www.suny.edu/facultysenate/TheCarnegieUnit.pdf> (accessed November 30, 2011).

accept three-year degrees for admission to graduate school but acknowledges that others do not. In fact, the article concedes:

None of the members of N.A.C.E.S. who were approached were willing to grant equivalency to a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution in the United States, although we heard anecdotally that one, W.E.S. had been interested in doing so.

In this process, we encountered a number of the objections to equivalency that have already been discussed.

commented thus,

“Contrary to your statement, a degree from a three-year “Bologna Process” bachelor's degree program in Europe will NOT be accepted as a degree by the majority of universities in the United States. Similarly, the majority do not accept a bachelor's degree from a three-year program in India or any other country except England. England is a unique situation because of the specialized nature of Form VI.”

* * *

International Education Consultants of Delaware, Inc., raise similar objections to those raised by ECE.,

“The Indian educational system, along with that of Canada and some other countries, generally adopted the UK-pattern 3-year degree. But the UK retained the important preliminary A level examinations. These examinations are used for advanced standing credit in the UK; we follow their lead, and use those examinations to constitute the an [sic] additional year of undergraduate study. The combination of these two entities is equivalent to a 4-year US Bachelor's degree.

The Indian educational system dropped that advanced standing year. You enter a 3-year Indian degree program directly from Year 12 of your education. In the US, there are no degree programs entered from a stage lower than Year 12, and there are no 3-year degree programs. Without the additional advanced standing year, there's no equivalency.

Finally, these materials do not examine whether those few U.S. institutions that may accept a three-year degree for graduate admission do so on the condition that the holder of a three-year degree complete extra credits.

Also in support of the evaluations, the petitioner submitted the “Findings from the 2006 CGS International Graduate Admissions Survey.” On page 11 of this document, it is acknowledged that 55 percent of all institutions in the United States do not accept three-year degrees from outside of Europe. The survey does not reflect how many of the institutions that do accept three-year degrees from outside of Europe do so provisionally. If the three-year Indian baccalaureate were truly a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. baccalaureate, it can be expected that the vast majority of U.S. institutions would accept these degrees for graduate admission without provision.

Finally, [REDACTED] relies on a UNESCO document. In support of his evaluation the petitioner submitted 138 pages of UNESCO materials, only two of which are relevant. The relevant language relates to “recognition” of qualifications awarded in higher education. Paragraph 1(e) defines recognition as follows:

“Recognition” of a foreign qualification in higher education means its acceptance by the competent authorities of the State concerned (whether they be governmental or nongovernmental) as entitling its holder to be considered under the same conditions as those holding a comparable qualification awarded in that State and deemed comparable, for the purposes of access to or further pursuit of higher education studies, participation in research, the practice of a profession, if this does not require the passing of examinations or further special preparation, or all the foregoing, according to the scope of the recognition.

The UNESCO recommendation relates to admission to graduate school and training programs and eligibility to practice in a profession. Nowhere does it suggest that a three-year degree must be deemed equivalent to a four-year degree for purposes of qualifying for inclusion in a class of individuals defined by statute and regulation as eligible for immigration benefits. More significantly, the recommendation does not define “comparable qualification.” At the heart of this matter is whether the beneficiary’s degree is, in fact, the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate. The UNESCO recommendation does not address this issue.

In fact, UNESCO’s publication, “The Handbook on Diplomas, Degrees and Other Certificates in Higher Education in Asia and the Pacific” 82 (2d ed. 2004) (accessed on April 1, 2012) at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001388/138853E.pdf> and incorporated into the record of proceedings), provides:

Most of the universities and the institutions recognized by the UGC or by other authorized public agencies in India, are members of the Association of Commonwealth Universities. Besides, India is party to a few UNESCO conventions and there also exists a few bilateral agreements, protocols and conventions between India and a few countries on the recognition of degrees and diplomas awarded by the Indian universities. But many foreign universities adopt

their own approach in finding out the equivalence of Indian degrees and diplomas and their recognition, just as Indian universities do in the case of foreign degrees and diplomas. The Association of Indian Universities plays an important role in this. *There are no agreements that necessarily bind India and other governments/universities to recognize, en masse, all the degrees/diplomas of all the universities either on a mutual basis or on a multilateral basis.* Of late, many foreign universities and institutions are entering into the higher education arena in the country. Methods of recognition of such institutions and the courses offered by them are under serious consideration of the government of India. UGC, AICTE and AIU are developing criteria and mechanisms regarding the same.

Id. at 84. (Emphasis added.)

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 (Comm'r 1988). *See also Matter of D-R-*, 25 I&N Dec. 445 (BIA 2011)(expert witness testimony may be given different weight depending on the extent of the expert's qualifications or the relevance, reliability, and probative value of the testimony). 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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg'l Comm'r 1972)). The evaluations of record are not consistent and provide little support for their determination as to the number of credits.

Given the serious inconsistencies in credits discussed above and between [REDACTED] statements and the remaining evidence of record, we have reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). According to its website, www.aacrao.org, AACRAO is "a nonprofit, voluntary, professional association of more than 11,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals who represent more than 2,600 institutions and agencies in the United States and in over 40 countries around the world." <http://www.aacrao.org/About-AACRAO.aspx> (accessed April 1, 2012). Its mission "is to serve and advance higher education by providing leadership in academic and enrollment services." *Id.* According to the registration page for EDGE, EDGE is "a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials." <http://edge.aacrao.org/info.php> (accessed April 1, 2012).

Authors for EDGE are not merely expressing their personal opinions. Rather, authors for EDGE 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 http://www.aacrao.org/Libraries/Publications_Documents/GUIDE_TO_CREATING_INTERNATIONAL_PUBLICATIONS_1.sflb.ashx. 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.

We have also reviewed AACRAO's Project for International Education Research (PIER) publications: the *P.I.E.R World Education Series India: A Special Report on the Higher Education System and Guide to the Academic Placement of Students in Educational Institutions in the United States* (1997). We note that the 1997 publication incorporates the first degree and education degree placements set forth in the 1986 publication. The *P.I.E.R World Education Series India: A Special Report on the Higher Education System and Guide to the Academic Placement of Students in Educational Institutions in the United States* at 43. As with EDGE, these publications represent conclusions vetted by a team of experts rather than the opinion of an individual. As with EDGE, these publications represent conclusions vetted by a team of experts rather than the opinion of an individual. In the 1997 publication on page 46, it states that the GNIIT title, within the National Institute of Information Technology (NIIT) system, is primarily a vocational/technical qualification, and that the entrance requirement is a class/Grade XII certificate.

The AAO accessed NIIT's website to determine what type of educational services it provides. See <http://www.niit.com/services/ITEducationforIndividuals/Pages/ComputerCourses.aspx> (accessed April 1, 2012). NIIT offers a career program (GNIIT); an engineering technology program (Edgeineers), which "helps engineering students and engineering graduates get acquainted with high-end technologies and meet requirements across their academic lifecycle;" networking and infrastructure management programs; basic computer programs; and short-term technology programs. *Id.* The website does not indicate that NIIT requires a college degree in order to admit a student to any of these programs. Further, there is no evidence that the beneficiary's admission to NIIT was predicated upon the completion of a bachelor's degree program.

One of the PIER publications also reveals that a year-for-year analysis is an accurate way to evaluate Indian post-secondary education. A *P.I.E.R. Workshop Report on South Asia* at 180 explicitly states that "transfer credits should be considered on a year-by-year basis starting with post-Grade 12 year." The chart that follows states that 12 years of primary and secondary education followed by a three-year baccalaureate "may be considered for undergraduate admission with possible advanced standing up to three years (0-90 semester credits) to be determined through a course to course analysis." This information seriously undermines the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] evaluations submitted, both of which attempt to assign credits hours for the beneficiary's three-year baccalaureate that are close to or beyond the 120 credits typically required for a U.S. baccalaureate.

It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the 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).

The director advised the petitioner that in the section related to the Indian educational system, EDGE provides that a three-year Bachelor of Commerce degree “represents attainment of a level of education comparable to two to three years of university study in the United States. Credit may be awarded on a course-by-course basis.” Moreover, EDGE further states:

The Postgraduate Diploma, following a two-year bachelor's degree, represents attainment of a level of education comparable to one year of university study in the United States. Credit may be awarded on a course-by-course basis.

The Postgraduate Diploma, following a three-year bachelor's degree, represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor's degree in the United States.

The entry continues:

Postgraduate Diplomas should be issued by an accredited university or an institution approved by the All-India Council for Technical Education (AICTE). Some students complete PGDs over two years on a part-time basis. When examining the Postgraduate Diploma, note the entrance requirement and be careful not to confuse the PGD awarded after the Higher Secondary Certificate with the PGD awarded after the three-year bachelor's degree. Rarely you may find a full time 2 year post graduate diploma.

Based on this juried opinion, the AAO concludes that the beneficiary's baccalaureate in this matter is only equivalent to three years of undergraduate education from a regionally accredited institution in the United States. Moreover, without evidence that NIIT is an accredited university or AICTE approved, the AAO cannot conclude that the beneficiary's postgraduate diploma from that institution is equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate.

After reviewing all of the evidence in the record, it is concluded that the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary has a U.S. baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree from a college or university. The petitioner has failed to overcome the conclusions of EDGE with reliable, peer-reviewed information. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as a professional under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act.

The AAO will also consider whether the petition may be approved in the skilled worker classification. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable 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. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(B) states:

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 [labor certification]. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

The determination of whether a petition may be approved for a skilled worker is based on the requirements of the job offered as set forth on the labor certification. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(4). The labor certification must require at least two years of training and/or experience. Relevant post-secondary education may be considered as training. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2).

Accordingly, a petition for a skilled worker must establish that the job offer portion of the labor certification requires at least two years of training and/or experience, and the beneficiary meets all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification.

In evaluating 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).

Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by regulation, USCIS must examine “the language of the labor certification job requirements” in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate about the beneficiary’s qualifications. *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].” *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification or otherwise attempt to divine the employer’s intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

The minimum education, training, experience and skills required to perform the duties of the offered position are found on the Form ETA 750, part A block 14 and 15, as shown below:

Block 14 (State in detail the MINIMUM education, training, and experience for a

worker to perform satisfactorily the job duties described in item 13 above):

Education (Enter number of years):

Grade school:	8
High school:	4
College:	4
College Degree Required:	Bachelor's degree
Major Field of Study:	Quantitative Discipline ⁹

Experience:

Job Offered:	2 years
Related Occupation:	2 years
Related Occupation (specify):	Database Administrator

Block 15 (Other Special Requirements):

Please see attached addendum for additional information on educational requirements – Quantitative Discipline [see footnote 3 below]

In summary, the position in this case specifically requires an interested applicant, including the beneficiary, to have at least a four-year bachelor's degree in any of the Quantitative Disciplines. Additionally, two-years of experience in the job offered or two years of experience in a related occupation as a Database Administrator are required. The petitioner does not state that a foreign equivalent degree is acceptable.

As is discussed above, the beneficiary possesses a Bachelor of Commerce degree from Ravishankar University, Raipur (M.P.), India which is equivalent to three years of university study at an accredited university in the United States. Additionally, the beneficiary has a post-graduate diploma from the National Institute of Information Technology, New, India, which is not accredited by the Indian government and thus may not be counted toward academic credit.

⁹ A degree in Quantitative Discipline, according to the petitioner, includes, but not limited to: Accounting, Automation & Telemetry, Biology (Botany or Zoology)/Biochemistry/Chemistry, Business/Business Administration/Applications, Commerce, Computer Applications, Computer Information Systems, Computer Science, Data Processing, Datametrics, Economics/Applied Economics, Engineering (Aeronautical, Agricultural, Chemical, Civil, Communications, Computer, Electrical, Electronic, Industrial, Manufacturing, Mechanical, Network, Telecommunications), Finance, Industrial Management, Information Technology, Management Information Systems, Mathematics, Physics, Statistics, and Theoretical Mechanics/Physics.

The labor certification does not permit a lesser degree, a combination of lesser degrees, and/or a quantifiable amount of work experience, such as that possessed by the beneficiary.¹⁰ The director permitted the petitioner to submit any evidence that it intended the labor certification to require an alternative to a U.S. bachelor's degree or a single foreign equivalent degree, as that intent was explicitly and specifically expressed during the labor certification process to the DOL and to potentially qualified U.S. workers.¹¹

In his RFE issued on February 13, 2008 the director advised the petitioner to submit, among other things, a signed recruitment report, the prevailing wage determination, all online and print recruitment conducted for the position, the posted notice of the filing of the labor certification, and all resumes received in response to the recruitment efforts, if any. The director also requested any other communications with the DOL that may be probative of the petitioner's intent, such as correspondences or documents generated in response to an audit.

In response to the director's RFE, counsel for the petitioner, among other things, submitted copies of the following evidence:

¹⁰ The DOL has provided the following field guidance: "When an equivalent degree or alternative work experience is acceptable, the employer must specifically state on the [labor certification] as well as throughout all phases of recruitment exactly what will be considered equivalent or alternative in order to qualify for the job." See Memo. from ██████████, Acting Regl. Adminstr., U.S. Dep't. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to SESA and JTPA Adminstrs., U.S. Dep't. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, Interpretation of "Equivalent Degree," 2 (June 13, 1994). The DOL's certification of job requirements stating that "a certain amount and kind of experience is the equivalent of a college degree does in no way bind [USCIS] to accept the employer's definition." See Ltr. From ██████████, Certifying Officer, U.S. Dept. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to ██████████ Esq., Jackson & Hertogs (March 9, 1993). The DOL has also stated that "[w]hen the term equivalent is used in conjunction with a degree, we understand to mean the employer is willing to accept an equivalent foreign degree." See Ltr. From ██████████ Certifying Officer, U.S. Dept. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to ██████████ INS (October 27, 1992). To our knowledge, these field guidance memoranda have not been rescinded.

¹¹ In limited circumstances, USCIS may consider a petitioner's intent to determine the meaning of an unclear or ambiguous term in the labor certification. However, an employer's subjective intent may not be dispositive of the meaning of the actual minimum requirements of the offered position. See *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act No. 06-2158 (D.D.C. Mar. 26, 2008). The best evidence of the petitioner's intent concerning the actual minimum educational requirements of the offered position is evidence of how it expressed those requirements to the DOL during the labor certification process and not afterwards to USCIS. The timing of such evidence ensures that the stated requirements of the offered position as set forth on the labor certification are not incorrectly expanded in an effort to fit the beneficiary's credentials. Such a result would undermine Congress' intent to limit the issuance of immigrant visas in the professional and skilled worker classifications to when there are no qualified U.S. workers available to perform the offered position. See *Id.* at 14.

- A letter dated November 20, 2002 from the petitioner addressed to the local DOL requesting a reduction in recruitment;¹²
- The in-house job posting posted from August 1, 2002 to August 23, 2002; and
- The advertisement for the job offered on *Computerworld* published on July 1, 2002.¹³

To show that the petitioner would hire job applicants even if they did not have a bachelor's degree, counsel submitted copies of the following evidence:

- A spreadsheet entitled "Summary of Computerworld Advertising Results – Infotech Consulting, Inc."; and
- Resumes of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

On appeal to the AAO, counsel points out that the job advertisement published in the *Computerworld* on July 1, 2002 stated that the petitioner would hire someone who had a "bachelor's degree or its functional equivalent." Counsel further states that the petitioner extended job offers to at least two applicants, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both of whom did not have a bachelor's degree.¹⁴ Counsel contends that the job advertisement combined with the

¹² The DOL at the time the Form ETA 750 was filed accepted two types of recruitment procedures – the supervised recruitment process and the reduction in recruitment process. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 656.21 (2002). Under the supervised recruitment process an employer must first file a Form ETA 750 with the local office (State Workforce Agency), who then would: date stamp the Form ETA 750 and make sure that the Form ETA 750 was complete; calculate the prevailing wage for the job opportunity and put its finding into writing; and prepare and process and Employment Service job order and place the job order into the regular Employment Service recruitment system for a period of thirty (30) days. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 656.21(d)-(f) (2002). The employer filing the Form ETA 750, in conjunction with the recruitment efforts conducted by the local office, should then: place an advertisement for the job opportunity in a newspaper of general circulation or in a professional, trade, or ethnic publication and supply the local office with required documentation or requested information in a timely manner. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 656.21(g)-(h) (2002).

Under the reduction in recruitment process, the employer could, before filing the Form ETA 750 with the local office, conduct all of the recruitment requirements including placing an advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation and posting a job notice in the employer's place of business. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 656.21(i)-(k) (2002).

¹³ The advertisement sought to hire computer programmers, software engineers, database administrator, and project leads. As stated earlier, the petitioner seeks to permanently employ beneficiary in the U.S. as a database administrator.

¹⁴ According to their resumes, [REDACTED] has an Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Degree in weather forecasting, and [REDACTED] has a two-year diploma in computer technology from a

fact that the petitioner extended job offers to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both of whom did not have a four-year bachelor's degree show that the petitioner's intent to hire job applicants was not only limited to those who have a four-year bachelor's degree.

Citing *Matter of* [name not provided], File No. [not provided] (AAO June 14, 2007), counsel claims that even though a four-year bachelor's degree is required by the petitioner employer, the petition does not have to be classified as a professional worker, it can also be classified and approved as a skilled worker. On the meaning of the words "functional equivalent" counsel cites a recent AAO decision – *Matter of* [name not provided], File No. [REDACTED] (AAO January 30, 2008) – in which the AAO indicates that functional equivalent means extensive high-level experience in the filed in question.

The AAO observes that while the *Computerworld* job advertisement included the words "functional equivalent" after bachelor's degree, all of the other evidence, such as the in-house job posting and the correspondence dated November 20, 2002 to the DOL requesting reduction in recruitment does not include the similar language or words. Further, the Form ETA 750, as noted earlier, does not include alternatives to a four-year bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent degree.

In addition, a review of the spreadsheet entitled "Summary of Computerworld Advertising Results – Infotech Consulting, Inc." reveals that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were both recruited as a result of job advertisement published in October 2001. The position in this case was advertised in July 2002. The record contains no evidence showing the copy of the advertisement published in October 2001. Nor does it include resumes of the people who applied for the position as a result of the job advertisement published in July 2002. For these reasons, we cannot confirm that the petitioner intended to hire job applicants even if they did not have a four-year bachelor's degree in 2002.

In summary, since there is conflicting evidence in the record regarding recruitment efforts, we cannot confirm or conclude that the petitioner intended to hire job applicants without a four-year bachelor's degree. As noted earlier, with the exception of the *Computerworld* advertisement, nowhere in the record did the petitioner include alternatives to a four-year bachelor's degree or foreign degree equivalent. Therefore, we cannot and should not look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that the DOL has formally issued to interpret the petitioner's intent. Based on the evidence submitted, it is clear that the petitioner intended to recruit U.S. workers who had a four-year bachelor's degree plus two years of work experience in the job offered or in a related occupation as a database administrator.

In this matter, the beneficiary has work experience which a third evaluator, [REDACTED] credits towards the beneficiary's degree equivalency. The beneficiary's experience in the job offered or as a database administrator, may not be credited towards a degree in combination with the beneficiary's three-year bachelor's degree and post-graduate training. The rule to equate three

years of experience for one year of education is not applicable to the instant I-140 immigrant petition as it only applies to non-immigrant H1B petitions. See 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5).

The petitioner failed to establish that the terms of the labor certification are ambiguous and that the petitioner intended the labor certification to require less than a four-year U.S. bachelor's or foreign equivalent degree, as that intent was expressed during the labor certification process to the DOL and potentially qualified U.S. workers.

Therefore it is concluded that the terms of the labor certification require a four-year U.S. bachelor's degree in a Quantitative discipline. The beneficiary does not possess such a degree. The petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary met the minimum educational requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification by the priority date. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as a skilled worker.¹⁵

We note the decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. Nov. 30, 2006). In that case, the labor certification 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 *14.¹⁶ In addition, the court in *Snapnames.com, Inc.* recognized that even though the labor certification may be prepared with the alien in mind, USCIS has an independent role in determining whether the alien meets the labor certification requirements. *Id.* at *7. Thus, the court concluded that where the plain language of those requirements does not support the petitioner's asserted intent, USCIS "does not err in applying the requirements as written." *Id.* See also *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act No. 06-2158 (D.D.C. Mar. 26, 2008)(upholding USCIS

¹⁵ For classification as a professional, the beneficiary must also meet all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977); see also *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

¹⁶ In *Grace Korean United Methodist Church v. Michael Chertoff*, 437 F. Supp. 2d 1174 (D. Or. 2005), the court concluded 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." However, the court in *Grace Korean* makes no attempt to distinguish its holding from the federal circuit court decisions cited above. Instead, as legal support for its determination, the court cites to *Tovar v. U.S. Postal Service*, 3 F.3d 1271, 1276 (9th Cir. 1993)(the U.S. Postal Service has no expertise or special competence in immigration matters). *Id.* at 1179. *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. See section 103(a) of the Act.

interpretation that the term “bachelor’s or equivalent” on the labor certification necessitated a single four-year degree).

In the instant case, unlike the labor certifications in *Snapnames.com, Inc.* and *Grace Korean*, the required education is clearly and unambiguously stated on the labor certification and does not include the language “or equivalent” or any other alternatives to a four-year bachelor’s degree.

In summary, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed a U.S. bachelor’s degree or a foreign equivalent degree from a college or university as of the priority date. The petitioner also failed to establish that the beneficiary met the minimum educational requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification as of the priority date. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as a professional under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act or as a skilled worker under section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act.

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.