





U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)



DATE: JUN 18 2013


OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(ii)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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 AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,


Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner is a social and healthcare service. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a program manager. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by labor certification application approved by the United States Department of Labor (DOL). The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the petition requires a bachelor's degree for entry into the occupation and, therefore, that the beneficiary cannot be found qualified for classification as a professional. The director denied the petition accordingly.

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.

As set forth in the director's March 25, 2013 denial, the single issue in this case is whether or not the petitioner has established that the petition requires at least a bachelor's degree or a foreign degree equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree such that the beneficiary may be found qualified for classification as a professional.

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.

Here, the Form I-140 was filed on November 5, 2012. On Part 2.e. of the Form I-140, the petitioner indicated that it was filing the petition for a professional.

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 On appeal, the petitioner provides no evidence that the position is for a professional and requires a bachelor's degree. Rather, the petitioner states that the position of program manager requires a bachelor's degree for entry into the occupation, but that it would consider an associate's degree for the position of program coordinator. The petitioner goes on to explain that a program coordinator can be promoted to the position of program manager after one year of work experience as a program coordinator. The petitioner does not disagree with the director's decision on appeal.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l) provides in pertinent part:

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

(4) Differentiating between skilled and other workers. The determination of whether a worker is a skilled or other worker will be based on the requirements of training and/or experience placed on the job by the prospective employer, as certified by the Department of Labor.

In this case, the labor certification requires a minimum of an associate's degree for the proffered position of program manager. However, the petitioner requested the professional classification on the Form I-140. There is no provision in statute or regulation that compels United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to readjudicate a petition under a different visa classification in response to a petitioner's request to change it, once the decision has been rendered. A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1988).

The evidence submitted does not establish that the petition requires at least a bachelor's degree or a foreign degree equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree such that the beneficiary may be found qualified as a professional.

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.