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

(b)(6)

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

DATE: AUG 30 2013 OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

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:

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,

for
Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Acting Director of the California Service Center (hereinafter "the director") 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.

On the Petition for Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129), the petitioner describes itself as a pharmacy and medical supply company established in 1985. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a management analyst 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 found that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position was a specialty occupation, and counsel for the petitioner filed an appeal. On appeal, counsel asserts that the director's basis for denial of the petition was erroneous and that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the response to the RFE; (4) the director's denial; and (5) the Form I-290B and accompanying 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 that the petitioner has not established eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director's decision will be affirmed, and the petition will be denied.

In a support letter dated April 18, 2012 (submitted with the petition), the petitioner stated that it wished to employ the beneficiary as a part-time management analyst. In the letter, the petitioner stated the following regarding the duties and responsibilities of the proffered position:

> The general duties of the Management Analyst include analyzing, revising financial, accounting, management, record and productivity systems in the business. Further, the Management Analyst will be expected to devise methods to increase profitability while managing expenditure and reducing overhead, studying organizational changes, communications, problem solving and procedures to suggest solutions to the issues, as well as gathering of data/information through diverse means and their analysis with regard to proposed or suggested changes to systems, procedures, organization or related matters.

The petitioner also stated that the specific duties of the beneficiary could be broken down into two categories: (1) management and analysis (80%); and (2) customer service (20%). Specifically, the petitioner identified the beneficiary's duties in these areas as follows:

Management & Analysis

- Maintaining up-to-date knowledge of federal and state regulations and standards applicable to our company

- Responsible for entering data to store and retrieve for analysis
- Investigate possible investment strategies that would benefit the company
- Provide insight to possible areas of improvement as well as areas [of] weakness
- Coordinate tests and observe the initial test/use of the products or strategies implemented to ensure their performance
- Collect data and develop feasible goals to promote company expansion
- Develop strategies to remain competitive
- Propose ways to restructure the company to maximize efficiency and profits
- Eliminate nonessential jobs
- Provide solutions to improve workflow efficiency
- Work with management to analyze company current services and products we sell and suggest improvements
- Provide management with a cost-benefit analysis so that we can decide whether implementing these new services and selling these new products will be financially reasonable
- Coordinating programs to ensure staff is knowledgeable to provide guidance regarding over the counter medications to our clients
- Coordinating with external vendors to obtain information related to capacity of vendor to meet orders and vendor quality standards
- Ensuring company goals, policies, revenue, and cost targets are met while monitoring quality assurance policies and procedures
- Conducting and examining study regarding shipping and storage of our products to improve efficiency and reduce cost
- Analyzing performances including efficiency, organization, attempts at selling products, marketing, managing finances, and adhering to budgets
- Examining of monthly inventory, recommending product levels and researching pharmacies operations to competitively position ourselves
- Communicating any abnormalities on a regular basis verbally and in written reviews
- Motivating team members to perform at optimum level, which directly contributes to the profitability and success of [the petitioner]

Customer Service

- Analyze current cliental [sic] and develop efficient strategies to better serve them
- Suggest improvements to management and coordinate the implementation of the new improvements
- Develop training manuals for new employees; which highlights the company's values of customer service

- Ensure that all refills and new prescriptions are delivered to the client in a timely manner

Regarding the petitioner's academic requirements for the proffered position, the petitioner claimed that the incumbent must possess a bachelor's degree in business, administration or a related field. The petitioner also submitted educational evaluations from of , equating the beneficiary's foreign degree in commerce to a U.S. bachelor's degree in business administration with a concentration in economics, as well as an evaluation from equating the beneficiary's two-year applied science in nursing course to a U.S. associate's degree in nursing.

In addition, the petitioner submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the instant H-1B petition. The AAO notes that the LCA designation for the proffered position corresponds to the occupational category SOC (ONET/OES Code) 13-1111, "Management Analysts," at a Level I (entry level) wage. The petitioner also submitted additional documentary evidence such as job vacancy announcements, photographs of the business, and copies of its quarterly tax returns.

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE. The petitioner was asked to submit additional information. The director outlined the specific evidence to be submitted.

Subsequently, the director received a response to the RFE. In addition to previously-submitted documents, the response included additional details regarding the proffered position, new job vacancy announcements not previously submitted, an expert opinion letter by ., and the petitioner's organizational chart.

The director reviewed the documentation and found it insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit. The director denied the petition January 25, 2013, and the matter is now before the AAO on appeal. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety.

The AAO notes that with respect to the preponderance of the evidence standard, *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-376 (AAO 2010), states in pertinent part the following:

> Except where a different standard is specified by law, a petitioner or applicant in administrative immigration proceedings must prove by a preponderance of evidence that he or she is eligible for the benefit sought.
>
> * * *
>
> The "preponderance of the evidence" standard requires that the evidence demonstrate that the applicant's claim is "probably true," where the determination of "truth" is made based on the factual circumstances of each individual case.

* * *

> Thus, in adjudicating the application pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, the director must examine each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true.
>
> Even if the director has some doubt as to the truth, if the petitioner submits relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads the director to believe that the claim is "more likely than not" or "probably" true, the applicant or petitioner has satisfied the standard of proof. *See INS v. Cardoza-Foncesca*, 480 U.S. 421, 431 (1987) (discussing "more likely than not" as a greater than 50% chance of an occurrence taking place). If the director can articulate a material doubt, it is appropriate for the director to either request additional evidence or, if that doubt leads the director to believe that the claim is probably not true, deny the application or petition.

Thus, in adjudicating the petition pursuant to the preponderance of the evidence standard, USCIS examines each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true. The "preponderance of the evidence" standard does not relieve the petitioner from satisfying the basic evidentiary requirements set by regulation. The standard of proof should not be confused with the burden of proof. Specifically, the petitioner bears the burden of establishing eligibility for the benefit sought. A petitioner must establish that it is eligible for the requested benefit at the time of filing the petition. 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. As will be discussed, in the instant case, that burden has not been met.

The issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner established 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)(l) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(l), 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.

In the instant case, the petitioner's letter of support indicated that it required the incumbent to possess, at a minimum, a bachelor's degree in business, administration or a related field. The petitioner provided an evaluation that indicates that the beneficiary's foreign academic credentials are equivalent to Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a concentration in Economics from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States. Although it appears that the beneficiary has satisfied the petitioner's own academic requirements, 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, a 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 demonstrate 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 at 147.[1]

Again, the petitioner in this matter indicates that the duties of the proffered position can be performed by an individual with only a general-purpose bachelor's degree, i.e., a bachelor's degree in business (or its equivalent). This assertion is tantamount to an admission that the proffered position is not in fact a specialty occupation. The director's decision must therefore be affirmed and the petition denied on this basis alone.

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 turns to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*1*) and (*2*): a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; and a degree requirement in a specific specialty is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty. Factors considered by the AAO when determining these criteria include: whether the *Handbook*, on which the AAO routinely relies for the educational requirements of particular occupations, reports the industry requires a degree in a specific specialty; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree in a specific specialty 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)).

The AAO recognizes the *Handbook* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.[2] As previously mentioned, the

---

[1] Specifically, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit explained in *Royal Siam* that:

> [t]he courts and the agency consistently have stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a business administration degree, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify the granting of a petition for an H-1B specialty occupation visa. *See, e.g., Tapis Int'l v. INS*, 94 F.Supp.2d 172, 175-76 (D.Mass.2000); *Shanti*, 36 F. Supp.2d at 1164-66; *cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Assocs.*, 19 I & N Dec. 558, 560 ([Comm'r] 1988) (providing frequently cited analysis in connection with a conceptually similar provision). This is as it should be: elsewise, an employer could ensure the granting of a specialty occupation visa petition by the simple expedient of creating a generic (and essentially artificial) degree requirement.

Id.

[2] The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed on the Internet, at http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/. The AAO's references to the *Handbook* are to the 2012 – 2013 edition available

petitioner asserts in the LCA that the proffered position falls under the occupational category "Management Analysts."

The AAO reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* entitled "Management Analysts," including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category.[3] As set forth above, the petitioner provided a list of duties for the proffered position that encompasses two areas: management and analysis and customer service. A review of the recited duties, however, demonstrates that they are vague and generic, and fail to specifically articulate the nature of the beneficiary's duties on a day-to-day basis. Although the petitioner was requested to provide additional details regarding the nature of these duties in response to the RFE, the petitioner simply resubmitted the previously-submitted list of duties.[4]

Such generalized information does not in itself establish a necessary correlation between any dimension of the proffered position and a need for a particular level of education, or educational equivalency, in a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. To the extent that they are described by the petitioner, the AAO finds, the proposed duties do not provide a sufficient factual basis for conveying the substantive matters that would engage the beneficiary in the actual performance of the proffered position for the entire three-year period requested, so as to persuasively support the claim that the position's actual work would require the theoretical and practical application of any particular educational level of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty directly related to the demands of the proffered position.

Furthermore, the record of proceeding indicates that the petitioner consists of eight employees. The AAO notes that it is reasonable to assume that the size of an employer's business has or could have an impact on the duties of a particular position. *See EG Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a/ Mexican Wholesale Grocery v Department of Homeland Security*, 467 F. Supp. 2d 728 (E.D. Mich. 2006). Thus, the size of a petitioner may be considered as a component of the nature of the petitioner's business, as the size impacts upon the duties of a particular position. In matters where a petitioner's business is relatively small, the AAO reviews the record for evidence that its operations, are, nevertheless, of

---

online.

[3] For additional information regarding management analyst positions, *see* U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., Management Analysts, on the Internet at http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/management-analysts.htm#tab-1 (last visited August 27, 2013).

[4] The regulations indicate that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary in the adjudication of the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8); 214.2(h)(9)(i). The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (8), and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

sufficient complexity to indicate that it would employ the beneficiary in position requiring the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that may be obtained only through a baccalaureate degree or higher in or its equivalent in a specific specialty. In the instant case, the petitioner has failed to establish how the beneficiary will be relieved from performing non-qualifying duties.

Without further clarification by the petitioner, it appears that the beneficiary will be employed in a lesser capacity or serving in a different position. The record of proceeding lacks (1) evidence corroborating that the petitioner has work that exists as an ongoing endeavor generating definite employment for the beneficiary's services (e.g., documentary evidence regarding the scope, staging, time and resource requirements, supporting contract negotiations, documentation regarding the business analysis and planning to support the work, a business plan); and (2) evidence that the beneficiary's duties ascribed would actually require the theoretical and practical application of at least a baccalaureate level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty, as required by the Act.

A position may be awarded H-1B classification only on the basis of evidence of record establishing that, at the time of the filing, definite, non-speculative work would exist for the beneficiary for the period of employment specified in the Form I-129. The record of proceeding does not contain such evidence. USCIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(1). A visa petition may not be approved based on speculation of future eligibility or after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *See Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm. 1971).

The petitioner has failed to provide sufficient details regarding the nature and scope of the beneficiary's employment or substantive evidence regarding the actual work that the beneficiary would perform. Without a meaningful job description, the record lacks evidence sufficiently concrete and informative to demonstrate that the proffered position requires a specialty occupation's level of knowledge in a specific specialty. The tasks as described fail to communicate the actual work that the beneficiary would perform; the complexity, uniqueness and/or specialization of the tasks; and/or the correlation between that work and a need for a particular level education of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty.

The petitioner's failure to establish the substantive nature of the work to be performed by the beneficiary precludes a finding that the proffered position satisfies any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), because it is the substantive nature of that work that determines (1) the normal minimum educational requirement for the particular position, which is the focus of criterion 1; (2) industry positions which are parallel to the proffered position and thus appropriate for review for a common degree requirement, under the first alternate prong of criterion 2; (3) the level of complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position, which is the focus of the second alternate prong of criterion 2; (4) the factual justification for a petitioner normally requiring a degree or its equivalent, when that is an issue under criterion 3; and (5) the degree of specialization and complexity of the specific duties, which is the focus of criterion 4.

Accordingly, as the petitioner has not established that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), 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.

Moreover, even assuming that the day-to-day duties of the proffered position would fall under the occupational category "Management Analysts," the AAO notes that the *Handbook* does not indicate that "Management Analysts" 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.

The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled "How to Become a Management Analyst" states in pertinent part the following about this occupational category:

> **Education**
> A bachelor's degree is the typical entry-level requirement for management analysts. However, some employers prefer to hire candidates who have a master's degree in business administration (MBA). In 2010, 28 percent of management analysts had a master's degree.
>
> Few colleges and universities offer formal programs in management consulting. However, many fields of study provide a suitable education because of the range of areas that management analysts address. Common fields of study include business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science, and engineering.
>
> Analysts also routinely attend conferences to stay up to date on current developments in their field.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., Management Analysts, http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/management-analysts.htm#tab-4 (last visited August 27, 2013).

When reviewing the *Handbook*, the AAO must note that the petitioner designated the proffered position as a Level I (entry level) position on the LCA. This designation is indicative of a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation.[5] That is, in

---

[5] The wage levels are defined in DOL's "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance." A Level I wage rate is described 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

accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, this wage rate indicates that the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation and carries expectations that the beneficiary perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he 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.

The *Handbook* does not support the assertion that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into this occupation. Rather, the *Handbook* states that many fields of study provide a suitable education for management analysts. The *Handbook's* narrative indicates that common fields of study include business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science, and engineering. According to the *Handbook*, a range of programs can help people prepare for jobs in this occupation. However, the *Handbook* does not conclude that normally the minimum requirement for entry into these positions is at least a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty*, or its equivalent.

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" 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 disparate fields (such as business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science and engineering) would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in *the* specific specialty," 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.[6] Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

> 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.

See 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.

[6] Whether read with the statutory "the" or the regulatory "a," both readings denote a singular "specialty." Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Still, the AAO does not so narrowly interpret these provisions to exclude positions from qualifying as specialty occupations if they permit, as a minimum entry requirement, degrees in more than one closely related specialty. As just stated, this also includes even seemingly disparate specialties provided the evidence of record establishes how each acceptable, specific field of study is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position.

Here, although the *Handbook* indicates that a bachelor's degree is the typical entry-level requirement, it also indicates that baccalaureate degrees in various fields are acceptable for entry into the occupation. In addition to recognizing degrees in disparate fields (i.e., business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science and engineering), the *Handbook* also states that a degree in business is acceptable. As noted above, 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 at 147. Therefore, the *Handbook*'s recognition that a general, non-specialty degree in business is sufficient for entry into the occupation strongly suggests that a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty* is not normally the minimum requirement for entry into this occupation.

Furthermore, the narrative of the *Handbook* indicates that a degree in engineering is also acceptable for management analyst positions. The issue here is that the field of engineering is a broad category that covers numerous and various specialties, some of which are only related through the basic principles of science and mathematics, e.g., nuclear engineering and aerospace engineering. Therefore, it is not readily apparent that a degree in any and all engineering specialties is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of a management analyst. As explained above, 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. Accordingly, as the *Handbook* indicates that working in these positions does not normally require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for entry into the occupation, it does not support the proffered position as being a specialty occupation.

It is incumbent upon the petitioner to provide persuasive evidence that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under this criterion, notwithstanding the absence of the *Handbook's* support on the issue. 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." As previously mentioned, 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)).

The AAO will now discuss the letter from Professor of Management at the . In the letter, claims that the proffered position is a professional position and would normally require, at a minimum, a Bachelor's Degree in Management, Accounting, Business Administration, or a related area.

First, it must be noted that conclusion that a degree in "Business Administration" is a sufficient minimum requirement for entry into the proffered position is inadequate to establish that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation. As discussed *supra*, a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate

prerequisite for a particular position, but 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 at 147.

provided a summary of his education and experience and attached a copy of his curriculum vitae. He described his qualifications, including his educational credentials and professional experience, as well as provided a list of the publications he has written. However, based upon a complete review of letter and curriculum vitae, the AAO notes that he has failed to provide sufficient information regarding the basis of his claimed expertise on this particular issue. claims that he is qualified to comment on the position of management analyst because of the position he holds at the as well as his professional experience and academic training. Without further clarification, it is unclear how his education, training, skills or experience would translate to expertise or specialized knowledge regarding the *current recruiting and hiring practices* of pharmacies/drug stores similar to the petitioner for management analyst positions (or parallel positions).

opinion letter and curriculum vitae do not cite specific instances in which his past opinions have been accepted or recognized as authoritative on this particular issue. There is no indication that he has published any work or conducted any research or studies pertinent to the educational requirements for management analysts (or parallel positions) in the petitioner's industry for similar organizations, and no indication of recognition by professional organizations that he is an authority on those specific requirements. The opinion letter contains no evidence that it was based on scholarly research conducted by in the specific area upon which he is opining. In reaching this determination, provides no documentary support for his ultimate conclusion regarding the education required for the position (e.g., statistical surveys, authoritative industry or government publications, or professional studies). asserts a general industry educational standard for organizations similar to the petitioner, without referencing any supporting authority or any empirical basis for the pronouncement.

Upon review of the opinion letter, there is no indication that possesses any knowledge of the petitioner's proffered position beyond the job description. The fact that he attributes a degree requirement to such a generalized treatment of the proffered position undermines the credibility of his opinion. does not demonstrate or assert in-depth knowledge of the petitioner's specific business operations or how the duties of the position would actually be performed in the context of the petitioner's business enterprise. His opinion does not relate his conclusion to specific, concrete aspects of this petitioner's business operations to demonstrate a sound factual basis for the conclusion about the educational requirements for the particular position here at issue. There is no evidence that has visited the petitioner's business, observed the petitioner's employees, interviewed them about the nature of their work, or documented the knowledge that they apply on the job. provides general conclusory statements regarding management analyst positions, but he does not provide a substantive, analytical basis for his opinion and ultimate conclusions.

Also, it must be noted that there is no indication that the petitioner and counsel advised that the petitioner characterized the proffered position as a low, entry-level position (as indicated by the wage-level on the LCA). As previously discussed, the wage-rate indicates that the beneficiary will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. It appears that would have found this information relevant for his opinion letter. Moreover, without this information, the petitioner has not demonstrated that possessed the requisite information necessary to adequately assess the nature of the petitioner's position and appropriately determine similar positions based upon job duties and responsibilities.

In summary, and for each and all of the reasons discussed above, the AAO concludes that the advisory opinion rendered by is not probative evidence to establish the proffered position as a specialty occupation. The conclusions reached by lack the requisite specificity and detail and are not supported by independent, objective evidence demonstrating the manner in which he reached such conclusions. There is an inadequate factual foundation established to support the opinion and the AAO finds that the opinion is not in accord with other information in the record.

The AAO may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions or 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). As a reasonable exercise of its discretion, and for the reasons discussed above, the AAO finds the advisory opinion letter as not probative of any criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). For efficiency's sake, the AAO hereby incorporates the above discussion and analysis regarding opinion letter into its analyses of each criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The fact that a person may be employed in a position designated as that of an management analyst and may apply analytical principles in the course of his or her job is not in itself sufficient to establish the position as one that qualifies as a specialty occupation. Thus, it is incumbent on the petitioner to provide sufficient evidence to establish that its particular position would necessitate accounting services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of knowledge in a specific specialty. This, the petitioner has failed to do.

The petitioner, therefore, has not established that the proffered position falls under an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, indicates that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement 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 position 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 failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*1*).

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 prong alternatively 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.

As stated earlier, 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 at 1165 (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. at 1102).

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 a standard industry-wide requirement of 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. The record does not contain any letters from the industry's professional association, indicating that it has made a degree a minimum entry requirement.

In support of the petition and again in response to the director's RFE, the petitioner submitted copies of job advertisements in support of the assertion that the degree requirement is common to the petitioner's industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. However, upon review of the evidence, the AAO finds that the petitioner's reliance on the job announcements is misplaced.

On the Form I-129, the petitioner stated that it is a pharmacy and medical supply company established in 1985. The petitioner also stated that it has eight employees and a gross annual income of approximately $5.6 million. The petitioner designated its business operations under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 44611.[7] The AAO notes that this NAICS code is designated for "Pharmacies and drug stores." The U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau website describes this NAICS code by stating the following:

> This industry comprises establishments known as pharmacies and drug stores engaged in retailing prescription or nonprescription drugs and medicines.

U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S Census Bureau, 2007 NAICS Definition, 44611 – Pharmacies and drug stores, on the Internet at http://www.census.gov/econ/industry/def/d44611.htm (last visited August 27, 2013).

---

[7] According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is used to classify business establishments according to type of economic activity and each establishment is classified to an industry according to the primary business activity taking place there. *See* http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/ (last visited August 27, 2013).

For the petitioner to establish that an organization is similar, it must demonstrate that the petitioner and the organization share the same general characteristics. Without such evidence, postings submitted by a petitioner are generally outside the scope of consideration for this criterion, which encompasses only organizations that are similar to the petitioner. In this matter, the petitioner submitted thirteen vacancy announcements for the following positions:

(1) Practice Management Analyst for a non-profit behavioral healthcare organization;
(2) Management Analyst I for , a 1,171-bed tertiary-care center;
(3) Business Analyst for , a national healthcare solutions provider;
(4) Business Analyst – Decision Management for a national healthcare solutions provider;
(5) Senior Business Analyst – Pharmacy Services, Strategic Analytics for , a national drug store/pharmacy chain;
(6) Analyst, Generic Pharmaceutical Operations for , a national drug store/pharmacy chain;
(7) Category Manager for , a national drug store/pharmacy chain;
(8) Analyst, Labor Control for a national drug store/pharmacy chain;
(9) Senior Analyst, Business for a national drug store/pharmacy chain;[8]
(10) Analyst, Seasonal Inventory Allocation for a national drug store/pharmacy chain;
(11) Analyst, Product Management for , a national drug store/pharmacy chain; and
(12) Category Manager (Health and Beauty) for a national drug store/pharmacy chain.

Upon review of the documentation, the petitioner fails 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. For instance, none of the advertisements appear to be for parallel positions in similar organizations. More specifically, the majority of the postings are for analyst positions in the nation's largest pharmacy/drug store chains, which cannot be deemed similar in size and scope to the petitioner's eight-person pharmacy. The remaining positions encompass positions in various healthcare fields, but fail to demonstrate a common degree requirement for a management analyst in a small, privately-owned pharmacy with one location. Moreover, all of these positions have experience requirements, which contradicts the petitioner's claim on the LCA, which indicates that the position is a Level I (entry level) position. The advertised positions appear to be for positions more senior than the proffered position. More importantly, the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the primary duties and responsibilities of the advertised positions are parallel to the proffered position.

[8] The AAO notes that this vacancy announcement, identified by Position , was submitted twice.

Consequently, the record is devoid of sufficient information regarding the employers to conduct a legitimate comparison of the organization to the petitioner. The petitioner and counsel failed to supplement the record of proceeding to establish that the employers are similar to the petitioner. That is, the petitioner has not provided any information regarding which aspects or traits (if any) it shares with the organizations.

As the documentation does not establish that the petitioner has met this prong of the regulations, further analysis regarding the specific information contained in each of the job postings is not necessary. That is, not every deficit of every job posting has been addressed. The evidence does not establish 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.[9]

When determining whether the petitioner and the organizations above share the same general characteristics, such factors may include 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 that may be considered). It is not sufficient for the petitioner and counsel to claim that the organizations are similar and in the same industry without providing a legitimate basis for such an assertion. As previously mentioned, 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. 165 (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190).

Thus, based upon a complete review of the record, the petitioner has not established 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)

---

[9] 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 these advertisements with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar companies. *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.")

As such, even if the job announcements supported the finding that the position of management analyst for companies that are similar to the petitioner requires 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 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.

located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner. 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.

To begin with and as discussed previously, the petitioner itself does not require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. In addition, the petitioner failed to credibly demonstrate exactly what the beneficiary will do on a day-to-day basis such that complexity or uniqueness can even be determined. Furthermore, the petitioner fails to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position.

Specifically, the petitioner failed to demonstrate how the duties of the proffered position as described require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform them. For instance, the petitioner did not submit information relevant to a detailed course of study leading to a specialty degree and did not establish how such a curriculum is necessary to perform the duties of the proffered position. While related courses may be beneficial, or even essential, in performing certain duties of a management analyst position, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate how an established curriculum of such courses leading to a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform the duties of the particular position here proffered.

This is further evidenced by the LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of the instant petition. Again, the LCA indicates a wage level based upon the occupational classification "Management Analysts" at a Level I (entry level) wage. The wage level of the proffered position indicates that the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation; that he will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results.[10]

Without further evidence, it is simply not credible that the petitioner's proffered position is complex or unique as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage. For instance, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."

---

[10] For additional information on wage levels, *see* 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.

Therefore, the evidence of record does not establish that this position is significantly different from other management analyst positions such that it refutes the *Handbook's* information to the effect that degrees not in a specific specialty are acceptable for management analyst positions. In other words, the record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as unique from or more complex than management analyst positions that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The AAO observes that the petitioner and counsel have indicated that the beneficiary's prior work experience will assist him in carrying out the duties of the proffered position. However, the test to establish a position as a specialty occupation is not the skill set or education of a proposed beneficiary, but whether the position itself requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge obtained by at least baccalaureate-level knowledge in a specialized area. In the instant case, the petitioner and counsel do not establish which of the duties, if any, of the proffered position would be so complex or unique as to be distinguishable from those of similar but non-degreed or non-specialty degreed employment. The petitioner failed to demonstrate 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. Consequently, it cannot be concluded that the petitioner has satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*).

The third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position. To this end, and where applicable, the AAO reviews the petitioner's past recruiting and hiring practices, as well as information regarding employees who previously held the position.

To merit approval of the petition under this criterion, the record must establish that a petitioner's imposition of a degree requirement is not merely a matter of preference for high-caliber candidates but is necessitated by performance requirements of the position. Upon review of the record of proceeding, the petitioner has not established a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

While a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a specific degree, that opinion alone without corroborating evidence cannot establish the position as a specialty occupation. Were USCIS limited solely to reviewing a petitioner's claimed self-imposed requirements, then any individual with a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the petitioner artificially created a token degree requirement, whereby all individuals employed in a particular position possessed a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty, or its equivalent. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 388. In other words, if a petitioner's stated degree requirement is only designed to artificially meet the standards for an H-1B visa and/or to underemploy an individual in a position for which he or she is overqualified and if the proffered position does not in fact require such a specialty degree or its equivalent, to perform its duties, the occupation would not meet the statutory or regulatory definition of a specialty occupation. *See* § 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining

the term "specialty occupation").

To satisfy this criterion, the evidence of record must therefore show that the specific performance requirements of the position generated the recruiting and hiring history. A petitioner's perfunctory declaration of a particular educational requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. USCIS must examine the actual employment requirements, and, on the basis of that examination, determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. In this pursuit, the critical element is not the title of the position, or the fact that an employer has routinely insisted on certain educational standards, but whether performance of 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. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if USCIS were constrained to recognize a specialty occupation merely because the petitioner has an established practice of demanding certain educational requirements for the proffered position - and without consideration of how a beneficiary is to be specifically employed - then any alien with a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty could be brought into the United States to perform non-specialty occupations, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate or higher degrees. *See id.* at 388.

The petitioner claims that its previous management analyst, held a Master of Science degree in International Business. Consequently, the petitioner concludes that this fact establishes that the petitioner routinely hires only specialty-degreed individuals for the proffered position and thus satisfies this criterion. The AAO disagrees.

In support of this contention, the petitioner submitted H-1B approval notice, his resume, and copies of the petitioner's quarterly wage reports evidencing his employment with the petitioner. The petitioner did not submit copies of degree, transcripts, or relevant educational evaluations. Moreover, even if such documentation had been submitted, the mere fact that the petitioner previously hired another individual with a general business degree to perform the duties of the proffered position does not establish eligibility under this criteria. As discussed above, the fact that a petitioner may have established a practice of demanding certain educational requirements for the proffered position – in this case, a business, administration or related degree – does not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. In addition to this deficiency, the petitioner did not submit any documentation regarding its hiring practices. This, coupled with the lack of evidence regarding the true nature of the position and whether it actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, precludes a finding of eligibility under this criterion.

The AAO reviewed the record of proceeding but finds that the petitioner has not provided evidence to establish that it normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the proffered position. Thus, the petitioner 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 the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The AAO again notes that the petitioner itself does not require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Further, the AAO notes that the petitioner has not provided sufficient 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 that they are more specialized and complex than positions that are not usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Furthermore, the AAO incorporates its earlier discussion and analysis regarding the duties of the proffered position, and the designation of the proffered position in the LCA as a low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupational category of "Management Analysts." The petitioner designated the position as a Level I position (the lowest of four assignable wage-levels), which DOL indicates is appropriate for "beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation." Without further evidence, it is simply not credible that the petitioner's proffered position is one with specialized and complex duties as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a substantially higher prevailing wage. As previously discussed, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."

The petitioner has submitted inadequate probative evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. Thus, the petitioner has not established that the duties of the position are 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 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.

As discussed in this decision, the petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence regarding the proffered position to determine whether it will require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Absent this determination that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a

specific specialty or its equivalent is required to perform the duties of the proffered position, it also cannot be determined whether the beneficiary possesses that degree or its equivalent. Therefore, the AAO need not and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications further.

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 director's decision is affirmed. The petition is denied.