

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Office of Administrative Appeals, MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

D2

[Redacted]

FILE: [Redacted] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 08 2010

IN RE: [Redacted] 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 in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion. The fee for a Form I-290B is currently \$585, but will increase to \$630 on November 23, 2010. Any appeal or motion filed on or after November 23, 2010 must be filed with the \$630 fee. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,  
  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director of the Vermont Service Center denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a software development and consulting company with 15 employees. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst 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 concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform services in a specialty occupation.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) counsel's response to the director's RFE; (3) the director's denial letter; and (4) Form I-290B with counsel's brief and supporting materials. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before reaching its decision.

Before discussing the director's basis for the denial, the AAO will first examine whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, as the beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation. Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO finds that the petitioner's proffered position does not qualify as a specialty occupation. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) defines the term "specialty occupation" as one 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 term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

An occupation which 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 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, the 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, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), 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 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

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. 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 professions. These occupations all require a baccalaureate degree in the specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation and fairly represent the types of professions that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

The petitioner states that it is seeking the beneficiary's services as a programmer analyst. The petitioner provided no job description of any kind or any document explaining the nature of its business and its minimum qualifications for the position. Moreover, the petitioner did not submit any evidence that it requires at least a bachelor's degree or equivalent experience in a specific specialty. Therefore, the AAO has insufficient information to determine whether the proffered position is even that of a programmer analyst, let alone whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

The director's RFE asked for documentation regarding the beneficiary's qualifications and stated that the credential evaluation submitted by the petitioner, which found the beneficiary has the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in arts and management information systems based on a combination of education and experience, was not acceptable because the evaluator did not appear to be qualified to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience. In response to the RFE, counsel simply resubmitted a copy of the credential evaluation that had already been determined to be insufficient by the director. Counsel did not submit any additional documentation in response to the RFE.

As stated above, insufficient evidence was submitted to determine whether the proffered position is actually that of a programmer analyst or under what other occupational classification the position might fall. Moreover, the petitioner never indicated that it has minimum requirements for the proffered position. 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)).

As the evidence of record does not establish that the particular position here proffered is one for which the normal minimum entry requirement is a baccalaureate or higher degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty closely related to the position's duties, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). This prong assigns specialty occupation status to a proffered position with a requirement for at least a bachelor's degree, in a specific specialty, that 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. As stated previously, insufficient evidence was submitted regarding the proffered position to determine whether it is actually that of a programmer analyst. Moreover, even if the petitioner could demonstrate, which it did not do, that the proffered position is actually that of a programmer analyst, the U.S. Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* does not indicate that programmer analyst positions normally require at least a bachelor's degree or the equivalent in a specific specialty.

The Programmer Analyst occupational category is encompassed in two sections of the *Handbook* (2010-11 online edition) – "Computer Software Engineers and Computer Programmers" and "Computer Systems Analysts."

The *Handbook* describes computer programmers as follows:

[C]omputer programmers write programs. After computer software engineers and systems analysts design software programs, the programmer converts that design into a logical series of instructions that the computer can follow (A section on computer systems analysts appears elsewhere in the Handbook.). The programmer codes these instructions in any of a number of programming languages, depending on the need. The most common languages are C++ and Python.

Computer programmers also update, repair, modify, and expand existing programs. Some, especially those working on large projects that involve many programmers, use computer-assisted software engineering (CASE) tools to automate much of the coding process. These tools enable a programmer to concentrate on writing the unique parts of a program. Programmers working on smaller projects often use "programmer environments," applications that increase productivity by combining compiling, code walk-through, code generation, test data generation, and debugging functions. Programmers also use libraries of basic code that can be modified or customized for a

specific application. This approach yields more reliable and consistent programs and increases programmers' productivity by eliminating some routine steps.

As software design has continued to advance, and some programming functions have become automated, programmers have begun to assume some of the responsibilities that were once performed only by software engineers. As a result, some computer programmers now assist software engineers in identifying user needs and designing certain parts of computer programs, as well as other functions. . . .

\* \* \*

[M]any programmers require a bachelor's degree, but a 2-year degree or certificate may be adequate for some positions. Some computer programmers hold a college degree in computer science, mathematics, or information systems, whereas others have taken special courses in computer programming to supplement their degree in a field such as accounting, finance, or another area of business. . . .

The *Handbook's* section on computer systems analysts reads, in pertinent part:

In some organizations, programmer-analysts design and update the software that runs a computer. They also create custom applications tailored to their organization's tasks. Because they are responsible for both programming and systems analysis, these workers must be proficient in both areas. (A separate section on computer software engineers and computer programmers appears elsewhere in the Handbook.) As this dual proficiency becomes more common, analysts are increasingly working with databases, object-oriented programming languages, client-server applications, and multimedia and Internet technology.

\* \* \*

[W]hen hiring computer systems analysts, employers usually prefer applicants who have at least a bachelor's degree. For more technically complex jobs, people with graduate degrees are preferred. For jobs in a technical or scientific environment, employers often seek applicants who have at least a bachelor's degree in a technical field, such as computer science, information science, applied mathematics, engineering, or the physical sciences. For jobs in a business environment, employers often seek applicants with at least a bachelor's degree in a business-related field such as management information systems (MIS). Increasingly, employers are seeking individuals who have a master's degree in business administration (MBA) with a concentration in information systems.

Despite the preference for technical degrees, however, people who have degrees in other areas may find employment as systems analysts if they also have technical skills. Courses in computer science or related subjects combined with practical experience can qualify people for some jobs in the occupation. . . .

Therefore, the *Handbook's* information on educational requirements in the programmer-analyst occupation indicates that a bachelor's or higher degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty is not a normal minimum entry requirement for this occupational category. Rather, the occupation accommodates a wide spectrum of educational credentials.

As evident above, the information in the *Handbook* does not indicate that programmer-analyst positions normally require at least a bachelor's degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. While the *Handbook* indicates that a bachelor's degree level of education in a specific specialty may be preferred for particular positions, the evidence of record on the particular position here proffered does not demonstrate a preference, much less a requirement, for the theoretical and practical application of such a level of highly specialized computer-related knowledge.

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)).

As already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. Also, there are no submissions from professional associations, individuals, or firms in the petitioner's industry.

Additionally, the petitioner has not satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which provides that "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." The evidence of record does not refute the *Handbook's* information to the effect that there is a spectrum of degrees acceptable for programmer analyst positions. Moreover, as mentioned previously, the record lacks sufficient information to distinguish the proffered position as unique from or more complex than programmer analyst positions that can be performed by persons without a specialty degree or its equivalent.

As the record has not established a prior history of hiring for the proffered position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, the petitioner has not satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Finally, the petitioner has not satisfied the fourth criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), which is reserved for positions with specific duties so specialized and complex that their performance requires knowledge that is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. As mentioned earlier, no duties were provided and so the AAO cannot determine that that they are more specialized and complex than programmer analyst positions that are not usually associated with a degree in a specific specialty.

Therefore, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under any of the requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Next, the AAO affirms the director's finding that the petitioner did not submit sufficient documentation to show that the beneficiary qualifies to perform services in any specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, the alien must meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (2) Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (3) Hold an unrestricted state license, registration or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
- (4) Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), for purposes of paragraph (h)(4)(iii)(C)(4) of this section, equivalence to completion of a *United States baccalaureate or higher degree shall mean achievement of a level of knowledge, competence, and practice in the specialty occupation that has been determined to be equal to that of an individual who has a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty and shall be determined by one or more of the following:*

- (1) An evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience;
- (2) The results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the *College Level Examination Program (CLEP)*, or *Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI)*;
- (3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials;

(4) Evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional association or society for the specialty that is known to grant certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty;

(5) A determination by the Service that the equivalent of the degree required by the specialty occupation has been acquired through a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to the specialty and that the alien has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation as a result of such training and experience.

In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5):

For purposes of determining equivalency to a baccalaureate degree in the specialty, three years of specialized training and/or work experience must be demonstrated for each year of college-level training the alien lacks. . . . It must be clearly demonstrated that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty evidenced by at least one type of documentation such as:

(i) Recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation by at least two recognized authorities in the same specialty occupation;

(ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in the specialty occupation;

(iii) Published material by or about the alien in professional publications, trade journals, books, or major newspapers;

(iv) Licensure or registration to practice the specialty occupation in a foreign country; or

(v) Achievements which a recognized authority has determined to be significant contributions to the field of the specialty occupation.

The beneficiary does not hold a U.S. degree and he did not complete four years of foreign university level education. Therefore, pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4), in order for the beneficiary to qualify for a specialty occupation, the record must demonstrate that he has education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, as well as recognition of his expertise through progressively responsible positions directly related to this specialty.

In support of the petition submitted on April 4, 2008, as well as in response to the RFE, the petitioner

provided a credential evaluation written by [REDACTED], a professor of mathematics and computer science at [REDACTED], writing on behalf of a credential evaluation service, stating that the beneficiary's education and experience amount to the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in art and management information systems.

As discussed above, the director issued an RFE on June 16, 2008, which stated that the evaluation previously submitted was insufficient because the record did not establish that Dr. M. Sambandham has the authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience, and requested additional documentation to demonstrate that the beneficiary has the equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. The petitioner simply resubmitted the same evaluation by [REDACTED] which resulted in the petition being denied on August 8, 2008.

Now, on appeal for the first time, counsel submits a second credential evaluation together with a letter from [REDACTED] and an undated letter from [REDACTED] Registrar at [REDACTED], which verifies that [REDACTED] has the authorization to review and approve academic credit for work experience. However, no evidence was submitted that [REDACTED] has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience *in a computer-related specialty* at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience. Therefore, the evaluation does not meet the standard of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1).

Aside from the decisive fact that the evidence of record does not establish [REDACTED] as competent under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1) to evaluate experience, the AAO finds that the content of her evaluation of the beneficiary's experience would merit no weight even if [REDACTED] were qualified under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1). No copies of the beneficiary's experience letters were provided and, although [REDACTED] states that the beneficiary's "[e]mployment experience is characterized by increasingly complex duties requiring systems implementation, software support and engineering, relational database management, information systems, information technology, and networking," she does not reference any evidence on which this assessment is based. Moreover, as indicated previously, as [REDACTED] does not have a background in computers, it is not clear how she is qualified to assess the beneficiary's alleged experience. As this evaluation does not establish a substantive basis for its conclusion, it would have no probative value even if it were rendered by an official qualified under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1). USCIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, USCIS is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It is further noted that this additional evidence is also not probative as it was submitted for the first time on appeal. The petitioner was put on notice of required evidence and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the visa petition was adjudicated. The petitioner failed to submit the requested evidence and now submits it for the first time on appeal. However, the AAO need not consider this evidence for any purpose. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988).

Additionally, the credential evaluation provided on appeal references the beneficiary's alleged education at [REDACTED] but no documentation was provided, such as copies of transcripts or a diploma, from this school. As the beneficiary allegedly attended this school from 2007-2008, it is possible that the beneficiary did not complete all the semester hours tallied in this assessment prior to the date the petition was filed. The petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5), USCIS may determine that the beneficiary has the equivalent of a degree in a computer-related field if he has a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to this specialty. The evaluation on record, however, is not supported by specific evidence. As previously discussed, no experience letters were provided, and so the AAO cannot determine whether the beneficiary's alleged experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, and subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in a computer-related field. The record lacks the required showing of the beneficiary's expertise in a computer-related field. The evidence does not establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform a specialty occupation.

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under any of the requirements at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). The AAO also affirms the director's decision that the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

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