

(b)(6)

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

DATE: FEB 07 2014 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER File: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:
[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

NZ
for

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

www.uscis.gov

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now on appeal before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner, through counsel, submitted a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) to the California Service Center on April 8, 2013. On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a "business advisory firm" with five employees, established in 2009. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a "Vice President of Marketing" position, the petitioner seeks to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition on June 7, 2013, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. The petitioner, through counsel, submitted a timely appeal of the decision. On appeal, counsel asserts that the director's decision was erroneous. Counsel submits a brief and additional evidence in support of the appeal.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's notice denying the petition; and (5) the petitioner's Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

For the reasons that will be discussed below, the AAO agrees with the director's decision that the petitioner has not established eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director's decision will not be disturbed. The appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

I. PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In this matter, the petitioner indicated in the Form I-129 and supporting documentation that it seeks the beneficiary's services in a position that it designates as a "Vice President of Marketing" to work on a full-time basis at a salary of \$34.40 per hour (\$71,552.00 per year).

The petitioner submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the instant petition. The AAO notes that the LCA designation for the proffered position corresponds to the occupational classification "Marketing Managers" - SOC (ONET/OES) Code 11-2021, at a Level I (entry level) wage.

In a support letter, dated February 28, 2013, that accompanied the Form I-129, the petitioner described the beneficiary's performance of the duties of the proffered position as follows:

As Vice President of Marketing, Operations Executive and Senior Advisor, [the beneficiary] will drive sales through marketing efforts, utilizing personal and in-depth knowledge of Indian markets to identify potential partners or clients and bring those through the whole partnership or sales process. He will manage development of customized marketing material for the entire company in

collaboration with the Executive Management Team. Other duties include recruitment and management for the [REDACTED] associate program, developing and executing management processes, and creating alignment between different stakeholders. He will be involved in project development, project execution, and development of our e-learning platform.

In the support letter, the petitioner stated that the educational requirements of the proffered position are "a Master's Degree in Business Administration or a related business field." The petitioner stated that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in the proffered position by virtue of his degree and his experience. The petitioner provided a copy of the beneficiary's Master's degree in Business Administration and unofficial transcript from the [REDACTED]

Upon review of the documentation, the director found the evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought and issued an RFE on May 14, 2013. The petitioner was asked to submit probative evidence to establish that a specialty occupation position exists for the beneficiary. The director outlined the specific evidence to be submitted.

On May 28, 2013, counsel for the petitioner responded to the RFE. Counsel included a letter from the petitioner in response to the RFE, dated May 22, 2013, which contained a revised description of the duties of the proffered position as well as the percentage of time devoted to each duty, as follows:

Drive sales through marketing efforts develop international client relationships (30% of time spent on this duty)[:]

- Utilize personal network and in-depth knowledge of Indian markets to identify potential partners or clients and bring those through the whole partnership or sales process.
- Manage develop[ment] of customized marketing material and other sales and presentation tools for all international markets.
- Manage web development team and vendors to ensure website supports marketing goals.
- Attend regional and international conferences and trade shows as part of marketing and branding objectives.
- Make sure all marketing efforts strengthen the company brand and drive sales.

Management and Recruiting (20% of time spent on this duty)[:]

- Recruit and manage [REDACTED] associate program. The associate program is used to groom talent [space inserted] for filling key position[s] in the company.
- Develop and execute management processes and create alignment between different stakeholders (executive, mid-level managers, and staff).
- Manage industry practice leads to ensure profitability of the practice segment.
- Develop business plan, business strategy, business cases etc.[,] for the entire company in collaboration with the Executive Management Team.

Product Development (10% of time spent on this duty)[:]

- Utilize cross-cultural background to develop products, such as assessment templates and training material for Indian cultures.
- Design structure and content for the e-learning platform.
- Manage the back-end logistics and operations of the platform such as registrations, support, payment[,] etc.

Project Execution/Senior Management Consulting (40% of time spent on this duty)[:]

- Utilize top-line business education, experience, cross-cultural background, and cross-cultural consulting certification, to function as senior subject-matter expert on projects related to [the] Indian Subcontinent or other international stakeholders.

In the letter in response to the RFE, the petitioner repeatedly noted that the minimum educational requirement for the proffered position was a bachelor's degree and stated the following:

The V.P. of Marketing [space inserted] role does not always require a baccalaureate degree, but this is highly dependent on which type of industry one refers to. In a company selling a simple product, such as toner, this is true, but in a highly complex strategic management consulting service firm as [the petitioner] a minimum [of a] Bachelor's Degree is definitely required. All [of the petitioner's] employees and consultants, even our associates, are required to have a Bachelor's Degree.

The petitioner and counsel also provided the following documentation in response to the RFE: (1) copies of two job postings; (2) copies of job descriptions for other positions within the petitioner's company that require baccalaureate degrees or higher; (3) copies of three different business proposals from the petitioner to three separate companies; (4) a copy of a prepared for and (5) copies of the petitioner's promotional materials, including information regarding the petitioner's

The director reviewed all of the information provided by the petitioner. Although the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary would serve in a specialty occupation, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish how the beneficiary's immediate duties would necessitate services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. The director denied the petition on June 7, 2013. Counsel for the petitioner submitted a timely appeal of the denial of the H-1B petition.

The issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, the AAO agrees with the director and finds that the evidence of record fails to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation.

II. FAILURE TO ESTABLISH THAT PROFFERED POSITION QUALIFIES AS A SPECIALTY OCCUPATION

A. Law

For an H-1B petition to be granted, the petitioner must provide sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term “specialty occupation” as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor’s or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states, in pertinent part, the following:

Specialty occupation means an occupation which [(1)] requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which [(2)] requires the attainment of a bachelor’s degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, a proposed position must also meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
- (2) The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
- (3) The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
- (4) The nature of the specific duties [is] so specialized and complex that

knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000). To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as providing supplemental criteria that must be met in accordance with, and not as alternatives to, the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

As such and consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) consistently interprets the term “degree” in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007) (describing “a degree requirement in a specific specialty” as “one that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of a particular position”). Applying this standard, USCIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such occupations. These professions, for which petitioners have regularly been able to establish a minimum entry requirement in the United States of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position, fairly represent the types of specialty occupations that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not simply rely on a position’s title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity’s business operations, are factors to be considered. USCIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. The critical element is not the title of the position nor an employer’s self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation, as required by the Act.

B. Analysis

As a preliminary matter, it must be noted that the petitioner's claimed entry requirement of a degree in "Business Administration" for the proffered position, without specialization, is inadequate to establish that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation. A petitioner must demonstrate that the proffered position requires a precise and specific course of study that relates directly and closely to the position in question. Since there must be a close correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a degree with a generalized title, such as business administration, without further specification, does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm'r 1988).

To prove that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge as required by section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specialized field of study or its equivalent. As discussed *supra*, USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position. Although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007).

Again, the petitioner claims that the duties of the proffered position can be performed by an individual with only a general-purpose degree, i.e., a degree in business administration. This assertion is tantamount to an admission that the proffered position is not in fact a specialty occupation.

Moreover, it also cannot be found that the proffered position is a specialty occupation due to the petitioner's failure to satisfy any of the supplemental, additional criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). To reach this conclusion, the AAO first turned to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which requires that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of the petition.

The AAO recognizes the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (*Handbook*) as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.¹

As previously discussed, the petitioner asserts in the LCA that the proffered position falls within the occupational category, "Marketing Managers." On appeal, the petitioner and counsel assert that "if one was to exclusively abide by [the *Handbook*], the position of the candidate is a mix of Marketing Manager (V.P. marketing) and Management Analyst (Senior Advisor)." However, it is noted that the petitioner and/or counsel never claimed that the proffered position is a mix of

¹ The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/>. The AAO's references to the *Handbook* are to the 2014-2015 edition available online.

two different occupational categories prior to the appeal. Also, the petitioner and counsel fail to show what aspects of the proffered position relate to the “Management Analyst” occupational category.² Assuming, for argument’s sake, that the management analyst responsibilities were found to qualify as specialty occupation duties, the petition could still not be approved if the portion of the proffered position that relates to the “Marketing Manager” occupational category also does not rise to the level of a specialty occupation.

Where a petitioner seeks to employ a beneficiary in two distinct occupations, the petitioner should file two separate petitions, requesting concurrent, part-time employment for each occupation. If a petitioner does not file two separate petitions and if only one aspect of a combined position qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS would be required to deny the entire petition as the pertinent regulations do not permit the partial approval of only a portion of a proffered position and/or the limiting of the approval of a petition to perform only certain duties. *See generally* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h). Furthermore, the petitioner would need to ensure that it separately meets all requirements relevant to each occupation and the payment of wages commensurate with the higher paying occupation. *See generally* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h); U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Emp’t & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf. Thus, filing separate petitions would help ensure that the petitioner submits the requisite evidence pertinent to each occupation and would help eliminate confusion with regard to the proper classification of the position being offered.

Again, as noted above, the petitioner asserts in the LCA that the proffered position falls within the occupational category, “Marketing Managers.” The *Handbook* contains the corresponding occupational category in the chapter entitled “Advertising, Promotions, and Marketing Managers.” The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled “What Advertising, Promotions, and Marketing Managers Do” states the following about this occupational category:

What Advertising, Promotions, and Marketing Managers Do

Advertising, promotions, and marketing managers plan programs to generate interest in a product or service. They work with art directors, sales agents, and financial staff members.

Duties

Advertising, promotions, and marketing managers typically do the following:

² Nevertheless, assuming, *arguendo*, that the proffered position’s duties as described by the petitioner would in fact be “a mix of Marketing Manager and Management Analyst,” the information in the *Handbook* regarding the “Management Analyst” occupational category indicates that management analysts do not comprise an occupational group for which at least a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry.

- Work with department heads or staff to discuss topics such as budgets and contracts, marketing plans, and the selection of advertising media
- Plan advertising and promotional campaigns
- Plan advertising, including which media to advertise in, such as radio, television, print, online media, and billboards
- Negotiate advertising contracts
- Evaluate the look and feel of websites used in campaigns or layouts, which are sketches or plans for an advertisement
- Initiate market research studies and analyze their findings to understand customer and market opportunities for businesses
- Develop pricing strategies for products or services marketed to the target customers of a firm
- Meet with clients to provide marketing or technical advice
- Direct the hiring of advertising, promotions, and marketing staff and oversee their daily activities

Advertising managers create interest among potential buyers of a product or service for a department, for an entire organization, or on a project basis (account). They work in advertising agencies that put together advertising campaigns for clients, in media firms that sell advertising space or time, and in organizations that advertise heavily.

Advertising managers work with sales staff and others to generate ideas for an advertising campaign. They oversee the staff that develops the advertising. They work with the finance department to prepare a budget and cost estimates for the advertising campaign.

Often, advertising managers serve as liaisons between the client requiring the advertising and an advertising or promotion agency that develops and places the ads. In larger organizations with an extensive advertising department, different advertising managers may oversee in-house accounts and creative and media services departments.

In addition, some advertising managers specialize in a particular field or type of advertising. For example, *media directors* determine the way in which an advertising campaign reaches customers. They can use any or all of various media, including radio, television, newspapers, magazines, the Internet, and outdoor signs.

Advertising managers known as *account executives* manage clients' accounts, but they are not responsible for developing or supervising the creation or presentation of the advertising. That becomes the work of the creative services department.

Promotions managers direct programs that combine advertising with purchasing incentives to increase sales. Often, the programs use direct mail, inserts in newspapers, Internet advertisements, in-store displays, product endorsements, or

special events to target customers. Purchasing incentives may include discounts, samples, gifts, rebates, coupons, sweepstakes, or contests.

Marketing managers estimate the demand for products and services that an organization and its competitors offer. They identify potential markets for the organization's products.

Marketing managers also develop pricing strategies to help organizations maximize their profits and market share while ensuring that the organizations' customers are satisfied. They work with sales, public relations, and product development staff.

For example, a marketing manager may monitor trends that indicate the need for a new product or service. Then they oversee the development of that product or service. For more information on sales or public relations, see the profiles on sales managers, public relations and fundraising managers, public relations specialists, and market research analysts.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., "Advertising, Promotions, and Marketing Managers," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/management/advertising-promotions-and-marketing-managers.htm#tab-2> (last visited Feb. 6, 2014).

The narrative contained in the *Handbook* does not indicate that advertising, promotions, and marketing managers constitute an occupational group for which normally the minimum requirement for entry is a specialty occupation level of education, that is, at least a U.S. bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled "How to Become an Advertising, Promotions, and Marketing Manager" states the following regarding the educational requirements for this occupational category:

A bachelor's degree is required for most advertising, promotions, and marketing management positions. These managers typically have work experience in advertising, marketing, promotions, or sales.

Education

A bachelor's degree is required for most advertising, promotions, and marketing management positions. For advertising management positions, some employers prefer a bachelor's degree in advertising or journalism. A relevant course of study might include classes in marketing, consumer behavior, market research, sales, communication methods and technology, visual arts, art history, and photography.

Most marketing managers have a bachelor's degree. Courses in business law, management, economics, finance, computer science, mathematics, and statistics are advantageous. For example, courses in computer science are helpful in developing an approach to maximize traffic through online search results, which

is critical for digital advertisements and promotions. In addition, completing an internship while in school is highly recommended.

Work Experience in a Related Occupation

Advertising, promotional, and marketing managers typically have work experience in advertising, marketing, promotions, or sales. For example, many managers are former sales representatives; purchasing agents; buyers; or product, advertising, promotions, or public relations specialists.

Important Qualities

Analytical skills. Because the advertising industry changes with the rise of digital media, advertising, promotions, and marketing managers must be able to analyze industry trends to determine the most promising strategies for their organization.

Communication skills. Managers must be able to communicate effectively with a broad-based team made up of other managers or staff members during the advertising, promotions, and marketing process. They must also be able to communicate persuasively to the public.

Creativity. Advertising, promotions, and marketing managers must be able to generate new and imaginative ideas.

Decision-making skills. Managers often must choose between competing advertising and marketing strategies put forward by staff.

Interpersonal skills. These managers must deal with a range of people in different roles, both inside and outside the organization.

Organizational Skills. Advertising, promotions, and marketing managers must manage their time and budget efficiently while directing and motivating staff members.

Id. at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/management/advertising-promotions-and-marketing-managers.htm#tab-4> (last visited Feb. 6, 2014).

While the *Handbook* reports that a baccalaureate degree is the minimum educational requirement for *most* advertising, promotions, and marketing management jobs, it does not indicate that such a degree is a minimum entry requirement or, more importantly, that the degrees or equivalencies held by such workers must be in a specific specialty that is directly related to advertising, promotions, and marketing management, as would be required for the occupational category to qualify as a specialty occupation, as that term is defined in section 214(i) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).³ See *id.* With no indication that such knowledge must be equivalent to a U.S.

³ For instance, the first definition of "most" in *Webster's New College Dictionary* 731 (Third Edition, Hough Mifflin Harcourt 2008) is "[g]reatest in number, quantity, size, or degree." As such, if merely 51% of marketing manager positions require at least a bachelor's degree, it could be said that "most"

bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, the *Handbook* is not sufficient evidence in and of itself that the particular position proffered here qualifies as a specialty occupation.

When, as here, the *Handbook* does not support the proposition that the proffered position satisfies this first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it is incumbent upon the petitioner to provide persuasive evidence that the proffered position otherwise satisfies the criterion, notwithstanding the absence of the *Handbook's* support on the issue. In such case, it is the petitioner's responsibility to provide probative evidence (e.g., documentation from other authoritative sources) that supports a favorable finding with regard to this criterion. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that “[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation.” Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

On appeal, counsel cites to *Residential Fin. Corp. v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services*, 839 F. Supp. 2d 985 (S.D. Ohio 2012), for the proposition that “[t]he knowledge and not the title [of the degree] is what is important.”

The AAO agrees with the aforementioned proposition that “[t]he knowledge and not the title of the degree is what is important.” In general, provided the specialties are closely related, e.g., chemistry and biochemistry, a minimum of a bachelor's or higher degree in more than one specialty is recognized as satisfying the “degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent)” requirement of section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act. In such a case, the required “body of highly specialized knowledge” would essentially be the same. Since there must be a close correlation between the required “body of highly specialized knowledge” and the position, however, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in two disparate fields, such as philosophy and engineering, would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be “in the specific specialty (or its equivalent),” unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required body of highly specialized knowledge is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties. Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added). For the aforementioned reasons, however, the petitioner has failed to meet its burden and establish that the particular position offered in this matter requires a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, directly related to its duties in order to perform those duties.

In any event, the petitioner and counsel have furnished insufficient evidence to establish that the facts of the instant petition are analogous to those in *Residential Fin. Corp. v. U.S. Citizenship &*

accountant positions require such a degree. It cannot be found, therefore, that a particular degree requirement for “most” positions in a given occupation equates to a normal minimum entry requirement for that occupation, much less for the particular position offered by the petitioner. Instead, a normal minimum entry requirement is one that denotes a standard entry requirement but recognizes that certain, limited exceptions to that standard may exist.

*Immigration Services.*⁴ The AAO also notes that, in contrast to the broad precedential authority of the case law of a United States circuit court, the AAO is not bound to follow the published decision of a United States district court in matters arising even within the same district. *See Matter of K-S-*, 20 I&N Dec. 715 (BIA 1993). Although the reasoning underlying a district judge's decision will be given due consideration when it is properly before the AAO, the analysis does not have to be followed as a matter of law. *Id.* at 719.

Upon review of the totality of the evidence in the entire record of proceeding, the AAO concludes that the petitioner has not established that the proffered position falls within an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, indicates that a requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally required for entry into the occupation. Furthermore, the duties and requirements of the proffered position as described in the record of proceeding do not indicate that the particular position that is the subject of this petition is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry. Thus, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I).

Next, the AAO reviews the record regarding the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). This first alternative prong calls for a petitioner to establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the petitioner's industry in positions that are both: (1) parallel to the proffered position; and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

In determining whether there is such a common degree requirement, factors often considered by USCIS include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." *See Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D. Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

Here and as already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Thus, the AAO incorporates by reference its previous discussion on the matter. Also, there are no submissions from professional associations, individuals, or similar firms in the petitioner's industry attesting that individuals employed in positions parallel to the proffered position are routinely required to have a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into those positions. Finally, for

⁴ It is noted that the district judge's decision in that case appears to have been based largely on the many factual errors made by the service center in its decision denying the petition. The AAO further notes that the service center director's decision was not appealed to the AAO. Based on the district court's findings and description of the record, if that matter had first been appealed through the available administrative process, the AAO may very well have remanded the matter to the service center for a new decision for many of the same reasons articulated by the district court if these errors could not have been remedied by the AAO in its *de novo* review of the matter.

the reasons discussed in greater detail below, the petitioner's reliance upon the job vacancy advertisements is misplaced.

In support of its assertion that the degree requirement is common to the petitioner's industry in parallel positions among similar organizations, the petitioner and counsel submitted copies of two job postings and a copy of a letter from the petitioner's client, [REDACTED]

In order for the petitioner to establish that another organization is similar, it must demonstrate that the petitioner and the organization share the same general characteristics. Here, the petitioner submits no documentary evidence demonstrating that the advertising employers are similar in size and scope to that of the petitioner, a "business advisory firm" with five employees. Thus, the record is devoid of sufficient information regarding the advertising employers to conduct a legitimate comparison of these organizations to the petitioner. Without such evidence, advertisements submitted by a petitioner are generally outside the scope of consideration for this criterion, which encompasses only organizations that are similar to the petitioner. When determining whether the petitioner and another organization share the same general characteristics, information regarding the nature or type of organization, and, when pertinent, the particular scope of operations, as well as the level of revenue and staffing (to list just a few elements) may be considered. It is not sufficient for the petitioner to claim that the organizations are similar and in the same industry without providing a legitimate basis for such an assertion. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. at 165 (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. at 190).

Moreover, contrary to the purpose for which the advertisements were submitted, the advertisements provided, however, do not establish that a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty*, or its equivalent, is required by the advertising employers. In addition, even if the job postings indicated that a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent was required, the petitioner fails to establish that the submitted advertisements are relevant as the record does not indicate that the posted job announcements are for a parallel positions in similar organizations in the same industry.

Thus, for the reasons discussed above, the petitioner's reliance on the job vacancy advertisements is misplaced. As a result, the petitioner has not established that similar organizations in the same industry routinely require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for parallel positions.⁵

⁵ Although the size of the relevant study population is unknown, the petitioner fails to demonstrate what statistically valid inferences, if any, can be drawn from such a limited number of advertisements with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar state universities. See generally Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research* 186-228 (1995). Moreover, given that there is no indication that the advertisements were randomly selected, the validity of any such inferences could not be accurately determined even if the sampling unit were sufficiently large. See *id.* at 195-196 (explaining that "[r]andom selection is the key to [the] process [of probability sampling]" and that "random selection offers access to the body of probability theory, which provides the basis for estimates of population parameters and estimates of error).

The AAO notes that on appeal the petitioner also submitted a copy of a letter, dated June 28, 2013, from its client, [REDACTED]. The letter from [REDACTED] states the following:

Consultants who advise on organizational and national culture issues are required to have specific skills and experience in organizational and national culture transformation. Thus[,] higher education (a Bachelor's degree at a minimum) is required. The consultants at [REDACTED] we have worked with are professional, highly knowledgeable in their field of expertise and have a Bachelor's or Master's degree.

The industry standard for hiring for this type of work generally requires a minimum of 2 years of experience and a Bachelor's degree.

Here, the petitioner has not submitted any evidence to indicate that [REDACTED] is a "similar firm in the petitioner's industry." Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. at 165 (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. at 190). Given that [REDACTED] is the petitioner's client, it appears unlikely that it is a similar firm in the same industry as the petitioner. Finally, the letter from [REDACTED] does not indicate that similar organizations in the same industry routinely require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for parallel positions.

Thus, based upon a complete review of the record, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not established that a requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common in the petitioner's industry for positions that are (1) parallel to the proffered position; and, (2) located in organizations similar to the petitioner. Thus, for the reasons discussed above, the petitioner has not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO will next consider the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which is satisfied if the petitioner shows that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

In the instant case, the petitioner failed to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position. Specifically, while the petitioner and counsel claim that the position is complex and unique and state that "[t]he petitioner's services, along with [the] sample proposals submitted, show the complexity of consulting assignments," the evidence in the record of proceeding fails to establish that the duties of the "Vice President of Marketing" position as described comprise a position so complex or unique that it can only be performed by

As such, even if the job announcements supported the finding that the position of "Vice President of Marketing" position at a "business advisory firm" required a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, it cannot be found that such a limited number of postings that appear to have been consciously selected could credibly refute the statistics-based findings of the *Handbook* published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that such a position does not require at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty for entry into the occupation in the United States.

a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. The AAO notes that on appeal the petitioner and counsel state that "[m]ore detail cannot be submitted on the models and tools used without violating intellectual property rights of the company." However, although a petitioner may always refuse to submit confidential commercial information if it is deemed too sensitive, the petitioner must also satisfy the burden of proof and runs the risk of a denial. *Cf. Matter of Marques*, 16 I&N Dec. 314 (BIA 1977).

Further, the petitioner designated the proffered position as a Level I (entry level) position on the LCA.⁶ This designation is indicative of a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation.⁷ That is, in accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, this Level I wage rate is only appropriate for a position in which the beneficiary is only required to only have a basic understanding of the occupation and would be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. This wage rate also indicates that the beneficiary would be closely supervised; that his work would be closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he would receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results.

⁶ Wage levels should be determined only after selecting the most relevant Occupational Information Network (O*NET) code classification. Then, a prevailing wage determination is made by selecting one of four wage levels for an occupation based on a comparison of the employer's job requirements to the occupational requirements, including tasks, knowledge, skills, and specific vocational preparation (education, training and experience) generally required for acceptable performance in that occupation.

Prevailing wage determinations start with a Level I (entry) and progress to a wage that is commensurate with that of a Level II (qualified), Level III (experienced), or Level IV (fully competent) after considering the job requirements, experience, education, special skills/other requirements and supervisory duties. Factors to be considered when determining the prevailing wage level for a position include the complexity of the job duties, the level of judgment, the amount and level of supervision, and the level of understanding required to perform the job duties. DOL emphasizes that these guidelines should not be implemented in a mechanical fashion and that the wage level should be commensurate with the complexity of the tasks, independent judgment required, and amount of close supervision received.

See DOL, Employment and Training Administration's *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagricultural Immigration Programs (Rev. Nov. 2009), available on the Internet at: http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf.

⁷ The wage levels are defined in DOL's "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance." A Level I wage rate is describes as follows:

Level I (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the employer's methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and results expected. Their work is closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. Statements that the job offer is for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship are indicators that a Level I wage should be considered.

By way of comparison, the AAO notes that a position classified at a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by the DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems." Thus, the wage level designated by the petitioner in the LCA for the proffered position is not consistent with claims that the position would entail any particularly complex or unique duties or that the position itself would be so complex or unique as to require the services of a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty.

The evidence of record does not establish that this position is significantly different from other "Vice President of Marketing" positions such that it refutes the *Handbook's* information that a degree in a specific specialty is not required for these positions, for entry into the occupation. In other words, the record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as more complex or unique than other positions in the pertinent occupation that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Consequently, as the petitioner fails to demonstrate how the proffered position is so complex or unique relative to other positions in the pertinent occupation that can be performed by an individual without at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into the occupation in the United States, the petitioner has not satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO next turns to the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), which entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent, for the position.

Of course, the AAO will necessarily review and consider whatever evidence the petitioner may have submitted with regard to its history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position and with regard to the educational credentials of the persons who have held the proffered position in the past. Here, while the petitioner states on appeal that "all members of the executive team and practice leads have a minimum of a Baccalaureate degree (most have masters or special certifications in the field)," there is no such evidence, as the record does not indicate that the petitioner has previously employed anyone in the proffered position.

As the petitioner has not provided any evidence to demonstrate a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position only individuals with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, it has not satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires a petitioner to establish that the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Upon review of the record of the proceeding, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. There is insufficient evidence in the record to establish that the duties of the proffered position require the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of a body of highly specialized

knowledge in a specific specialty.

The AAO finds that the petitioner has not provided probative evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. In the instant case, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position. That is, the proposed duties have not been described with sufficient specificity to establish their nature as more specialized and complex than the nature of the duties of other positions in the pertinent occupational category whose performance does not require the application of knowledge usually associated with attainment of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

In this regard, the AAO here incorporates into this analysis its earlier comments and findings with regard to the implication of the Level I wage-rate designation (the lowest of four possible wage-levels) in the LCA. That is, that the proffered position's Level I wage designation is indicative of a low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupational category and hence one not likely distinguishable by relatively specialized and complex duties. As noted earlier, the DOL indicates that a Level I designation is appropriate for "beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation."

The petitioner has submitted insufficient evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. That is, the petitioner has not established that the nature of the duties of the position is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The AAO, therefore, concludes that the petitioner failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has failed to establish that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) and, therefore, it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied for this reason.

The AAO does not need to examine the issue of the beneficiary's qualifications, because the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. In other words, the beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation.

III. CONCLUSION

In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.