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

(b)(6)

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

DATE: MAY 30 2013 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER FILE:

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:

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, Texas Service Center (director), denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The petitioner appealed the decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as an information technology consulting company. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a systems analyst. 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 an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent 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 July 25, 2007. *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 or foreign equivalent as required by the terms of the labor certification.

The record shows that the appeal is properly filed 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 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

[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).

> (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.

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:

---

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

> 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 petition for a professional or skilled worker. The petitioner did not specify elsewhere in the record of proceeding whether the petition should be considered under 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

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)(l), (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. § 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

---

classification assigned to the offered position by the DOL, the AAO will consider the petition under both the professional and skilled worker categories.

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 possesses a bachelor's degree from , India, completed in 1995. The record contains a copy of the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science diploma and transcripts from , India, issued in 1996.

In response to a Request for Evidence (RFE) issued by the AAO on March 5, 2013, the petitioner submitted the beneficiary's 2011 Master of Business Administration degree from the As this degree was awarded after the priority date, it cannot be considered in determining whether the beneficiary had the education required by the terms of the labor certification prior to the priority date. A petitioner must establish the elements for the approval of the petition at the time of filing. A petition may not be approved if the beneficiary was not qualified at the priority date, but expects to become eligible at a subsequent time. *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm'r 1971).

The record contains an undated evaluation of the beneficiary's educational credentials prepared by of , which concludes that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science in Computer Science degree from is equivalent to a U.S. Bachelor of Science degree in Physics, Mathematics, and Computer Science. The petitioner submitted a second evaluation dated June 11, 2006 from for , which reaches the same conclusion. Both evaluations rely upon "contact hours" and the Carnegie Unit. explains that as the Indian school year is longer and requires the students to attend more hours of classes, the amount of time in years that a degree takes in India is insufficient to determine whether the degree is equivalent to one earned in the United States. 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. credibility is serious diminished as he completely distorts an article by and . Specifically, 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 ways 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. Moreover, he completed his three-year degree in the second division, not the first division. Finally, the record lacks evidence that the beneficiary completed a valid, recognized post graduate degree. Thus, reliance on this article is disingenuous.

Ultimately, the record contains no evidence that the Carnegie Unit is a useful way to evaluate Indian degrees. According to the Carnegie Foundation's own website, http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/faqs (accessed May 21, 2013 and incorporated into the record of proceeding), the Carnegie Unit represents 120 high school hours in one subject. Fourteen "units" warrant admission to college. The website concludes: "The 'Carnegie Unit' does not apply to higher education."

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. Robert A. Watkins, 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 May 21, 2013 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.*

Finally, relies on a UNESCO document. 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 an 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 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.[4]

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 May 21, 2013 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

[4] The evaluation references the United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization ("U.N.E.S.C.O.") Recommendation on the Recognition of Studies and Qualifications in Higher Education in 1993. UNESCO has six regional conventions on the recognition of qualifications, and one interregional convention. A UNESCO convention on the recognition of qualifications is a legal agreement between countries agreeing to recognize academic qualifications issued by other countries that have ratified the same agreement. While India has ratified one UNESCO convention on the recognition of qualifications (Asia and the Pacific), the United States has ratified none of the UNESCO conventions on the recognition of qualifications. In an effort to move toward a single universal convention, the UNESCO General Conference adopted a Recommendation on the Recognition of Studies and Qualifications in Higher Education in 1993. The United States was not a member of UNESCO between 1984 and 2002, and the Recommendation on the Recognition of Studies and Qualifications in Higher Education is not a binding legal agreement to recognize academic qualifications between UNESCO members. *See* http://www.unesco.org (accessed May 29, 2013).

> 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.)

also cites to the UNESCO conventions referenced above and cites a number of British and United States colleges that accept three-year degree holders to their Master's degree programs. It is interesting to note that summary of some of these colleges' requirements indicate that the beneficiary would not be eligible. For example, the summary of the requirements for the University of Manchester indicate that holders of a three-year degree "who have obtained First Class at a reputable university" are eligible for the program, however, the beneficiary did not graduate in the first class. In addition, cites to the portion of the CGS' Research Report which states that only 56% of graduate schools in the United States would accept someone with the beneficiary's degree into their Master's program. The sources cited by support the argument that some colleges and universities accept the three-year degree, but her sources do not support her ultimate conclusion that a three-year degree is equivalent to a United States baccalaureate.

The petitioner relies on the beneficiary's three-year bachelor's degree 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). 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.

As advised in the March 5, 2013 RFE, the AAO has reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). According to its website, 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." *See* http://www.aacrao.org/About-AACRAO.aspx. Its mission "is to serve and advance higher education by providing leadership in academic and enrollment services." *Id.* EDGE is "a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials." *See*

http://edge.aacrao.org/info.php. 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.[5] 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.* USCIS considers EDGE to be a reliable, peer-reviewed source of information about foreign credentials equivalencies.[6]

According to EDGE, a three-year Bachelor of Science degree from India is comparable to "three years of university study in the United States." Therefore, based on the conclusions of EDGE, the evidence in the record on appeal was not sufficient to establish that the beneficiary possesses the foreign equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in Computer Science. In the RFE, the AAO advised the petitioner that any additional credentials evaluations submitted should specifically address the conclusions of EDGE.

After reviewing all of the evidence in the record, the AAO concludes 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.

It is additionally noted that the job advertisement for the proffered position that the president of the petitioner attested was placed on its premises states that experience in various computer languages was required and that the salary offered was $65,000 per year. DOL regulations required the petitioner to give notice of the filing of the application for permanent employment certification, including "If there is no such bargaining representative, by posted notice to the employer's employees at the facility or location of the employment. The notice must be posted for at least 10 consecutive business days. The notice must be clearly visible and unobstructed while posted and

---

[5] *See An Author's Guide to Creating AACRAO International Publications* available at http://www.aacrao.org/Libraries/Publications_Documents/GUIDE_TO_CREATING_INTERNATIONAL_PUBLICATIONS_1.sflb.ashx.

[6] In *Confluence Intern., Inc. v. Holder,* 2009 WL 825793 (D.Minn. March 27, 2009), the court determined that the AAO provided a rational explanation for its reliance on information provided by AACRAO to support its decision. In *Tisco Group, Inc. v. Napolitano*, 2010 WL 3464314 (E.D.Mich. August 30, 2010), the court found that USCIS had properly weighed the evaluations submitted and the information obtained from EDGE to conclude that the alien's three-year foreign "baccalaureate" and foreign "Master's" degree were only comparable to a U.S. bachelor's degree. In *Sunshine Rehab Services, Inc.* 2010 WL 3325442 (E.D.Mich. August 20, 2010), the court upheld a USCIS determination that the alien's three-year bachelor's degree was not a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor's degree. Specifically, the court concluded that USCIS was entitled to prefer the information in EDGE and did not abuse its discretion in reaching its conclusion. The court also noted that the labor certification itself required a degree and did not allow for the combination of education and experience.

must be posted in conspicuous places where the employer's U.S. workers can readily read the posted notice on their way to or from their place of employment." 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d)(ii). Because the notice contained a proffered wage below that of the certified wage provided on the labor certification and no education or years of experience required, it is insufficient to demonstrate that the petitioner advertised the position as required by 20 C.F.R. § 656.10(d)(ii). In any further filings, the petitioner should submit evidence demonstrating its compliance with the recruitment requirements.

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 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.

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position has the following minimum requirements:

H.4. Education: Bachelor's in Computer Science.
H.5. Training: None required.
H.6. Experience in the job offered: 24 months.
H.7. Alternate field of study: Engineering or Mathematics.
H.8. Alternate combination of education and experience: None accepted.
H.9. Foreign educational equivalent: Accepted.
H.10. Experience in an alternate occupation: Yes, 24 months as [e]ngineer or programmer analyst or consultant.
H.14. Specific skills or other requirements: Two or more of the following: SAP/SEM, NetWeaver, VB, Sybase, Oracle/11i, Telecom, Datacom, Design/Architecture, VB.net, CMM, JDBC, Servlets, Cobol, QMF, JCL, VSAM, Java/J2ee, SOAP, Weblogic, Websphere, SAS, Macros, SQL, Informatica, Data Stage or Business Applications.

As is discussed above, the beneficiary possesses a Bachelor of Science degree in Physics, Mathematics, and Computer Science from , India, which is equivalent to three years of U.S. baccalaureate studies.

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.[7] Nonetheless, the AAO RFE permitted the petitioner to submit any evidence that it intended the labor certification to

[7] 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 Anna C. Hall, 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 Paul R. Nelson, Certifying Officer, U.S. Dept. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to Lynda Won-Chung, 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 Paul R. Nelson, Certifying Officer, U.S. Dept. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to Joseph Thomas, INS (October 27, 1992). To our knowledge, these field guidance memoranda have not been rescinded.

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.[8] Specifically, the AAO requested that the petitioner provide a copy of the signed recruitment report required by 20 C.F.R. § 656, together with copies of the prevailing wage determination, all 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.

In response to the RFE, the petitioner did not submit any additional credentials evaluations. Counsel submits job advertisements placed on and the petitioner's own website. The and advertisements state that a Bachelor's Degree in Computer Science or Engineering is required. None of the advertisements state that any sort of education and experience equivalent would be accepted. Instead, the majority of the advertisements were for multiple positions which stated that education and/or experience was required depending on the position, but did not specify the education and experience required for each specific position. A number of other advertisements submitted included more than one position, but indicated that the minimum education required for a systems analyst was varied: some required a Master of Science degree; while others required a bachelor degree plus two or three years of experience. Therefore, these advertisements do not establish that the requirements for the proffered position was education less than a bachelor's degree.

As stated above, the job advertisements submitted in response to the AAO's RFE do not establish that the petitioner intended that the educational requirements of the position be any less than the stated bachelor's degree required by the terms of the labor certification. It is additionally noted that the RFE specifically requested that the petitioner submit a copy of the signed recruitment report required by 20 C.F.R. § 656.17(g)(1), copies of the prevailing wage determination, and all resumes received in response to the recruitment efforts. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

The petitioner failed to establish that that the terms of the labor certification are ambiguous and that it intended the labor certification to require less than a four-year U.S. bachelor's or foreign

---

[8] 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.

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 Computer Science or a foreign equivalent degree. 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.[9]

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.[10] 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 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

---

[9] In addition, 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)(l), (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).

[10] 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.

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.