



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)

DATE: JUL 28 2014

OFFICE: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

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

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

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,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

The petitioner submitted a Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129) to the Vermont Service Center on April 1, 2013. In the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a retail store established in 2005. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a human resource specialist position, the petitioner seeks to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition on October 9, 2013, finding that the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the director's basis for denial of the petition was erroneous and contends that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

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

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

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In this matter, the petitioner stated in the Form I-129 that it seeks the beneficiary's services as a human resource specialist to work on a full-time basis at a salary of \$65,000 per year. The petitioner also provided a job description.

Further, the petitioner stated that the "usual minimum requirement for this position is a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration, Human Resources, or a closely-related field." With the petition, the petitioner provided a copy of the beneficiary's International Master of Business Administration degree from Stratford University and copies of his foreign diploma and academic transcripts.

The petitioner also submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the instant H-1B petition. We note that the LCA designation for the proffered position corresponds to the occupational classification of "Human Resource, Labor Relations and Training Specialists, All" – SOC (ONET/OES Code) 13-1078, at a Level IV (fully competent).¹

¹ The wage levels are defined in DOL's "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance." A Level IV wage rate is described as follows:

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE on April 29, 2013. The petitioner and counsel responded to the RFE.² In response to the RFE, the petitioner provided a percentage breakdown of the proposed duties as follows:

- Monitor and analyze data from each location including staff performance, operations efficiency, customer satisfaction, and sales volume, and make recommendations for staffing levels, and rotation adjustments; (35% of time)
- Hire and fire employees, and process relevant paperwork; (8% of time)
- Interview potential applicants and inform applicants of work details such as job duties, responsibilities, compensation, schedules, working conditions, and promotion opportunities; (25% of time)
- Prepare and maintain employment records for hiring, firing, leaves, disciplinary issues, and complaints using human resource management system software; (12% of time)
- Develop and implement personnel policies and procedures, and ensure that policies and procedures are in compliance with Federal, State, and local labor laws and regulations as well as contractual requirements under the franchise agreement; (15% of time)
- Address employee issues such as complaints, harassment allegations, or other employee concerns. (5% of time)

Level IV (fully competent) wage rates are assigned to job offers for competent employees who have sufficient experience in the occupation to plan and conduct work requiring judgment and the independent evaluation, selection, modification, and application of standard procedures and techniques. Such employees use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems. These employees receive only technical guidance and their work is reviewed only for application of sound judgment and effectiveness in meeting the establishment's procedures and expectations. They generally have management and/or supervisory responsibilities.

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.

² It must be noted for the record that counsel mistakenly and repeatedly referenced the proffered position as market research specialist in the July 22, 2013 letter. The record provides no explanation for this inconsistency. Thus, we must question the accuracy of the letter and whether the information provided is correctly attributed to this particular position and beneficiary.

Although the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary would serve in a specialty occupation, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish how the beneficiary's immediate duties would necessitate services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. The director denied the petition on October 9, 2013. Counsel submitted an appeal of the denial of the H-1B petition. With the appeal, counsel submitted a brief, along with previously submitted documentation and new evidence.³

II. BEYOND THE DIRECTOR'S DECISION

Educational Requirement

Beyond the decision of the director, it must be noted that the petitioner's claim that a bachelor's 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. A petitioner must demonstrate that the proffered position requires a precise and specific course of study that relates directly and closely to the position in question. Since there must be a close correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a degree with a generalized title, such as business administration, without further specification, does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm'r 1988).

To prove that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge as required by section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specialized field of study or its equivalent. As discussed *supra*, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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

³ With regard to the new documentation submitted on appeal that was encompassed by the director's RFE, we note that this evidence is outside the scope of the appeal. 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).

Where, as here, a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, we will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *see also Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533. If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, it should have submitted it with the initial petition or in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* The petitioner has not provided a valid reason for not previously submitting the evidence. Under the circumstances, we need not consider the sufficiency of such evidence requested in the RFE but submitted for the first time on appeal. Nevertheless, we reviewed the documentation but find that it fails to establish eligibility that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions.

as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007)⁴

Again, the petitioner in this matter claims 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 administration. 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.

III. ISSUE

We will now address the director's basis for denial of the petition, namely that the petitioner failed to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, and for the specific reasons described below, we agree with the director and find that the evidence fails to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation.

IV. SPECIALTY OCCUPATION

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

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

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and

⁴ 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: otherwise, 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.

- (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 stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing 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), 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 at 147 (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.

We will first review the record of proceeding in relation to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which requires that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.

We recognize the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL's) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.⁵ As previously discussed, the petitioner asserts in LCA that the proffered position falls under the occupational category "Human Resources, Training and Labor Relations Specialists, All."

We reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* entitled "Human Resources Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists" including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category.⁶ However, the *Handbook* does not indicate that "Human Resource

⁵ All of our references are to the 2014-2015 edition of the *Handbook*, which may be accessed at the Internet site <http://www.bls.gov/OCO/>. We hereby incorporate into the record of proceeding the chapter of the *Handbook* regarding "Human Resources Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists."

⁶ For additional information regarding the occupational category "Human Resources Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists," see U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., Human Resources Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists, on the Internet at

Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists" 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 into the occupation.

The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled "How to Become a Human Resource Specialist or Labor Relations Specialist" states, in pertinent part, the following about this occupation:

Applicants must usually have a bachelor's degree. However, the level of education and experience required to become a human resources specialist or labor relations specialist varies by position and employer.

Education

Applicants seeking positions as human resources specialists or labor relations specialists must usually have a bachelor's degree in human resources, business, or a related field.

Coursework should include business, professional writing, human resource management, and accounting.

Work Experience in a Related Occupation

Although candidates with a high school diploma may qualify for some interviewing and recruiting positions, employers usually require several years of related work experience as a substitute for education.

Some positions, particularly human resources generalists, may require work experience. Candidates often gain experience as human resources assistants, in customer service positions, or in other related jobs.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., Human Resources Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/human-resources-specialists-and-labor-relations-specialists.htm#tab-4> (last visited July 24, 2014).

The *Handbook* does not state that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation. Although the *Handbook* indicates that "[a]pplicants must usually have a bachelor's degree," the *Handbook* does not indicate that such a degree need be in a *specific specialty*. Specifically, the *Handbook* states that "[a]pplicants seeking positions as human resources specialists or labor relations specialists must usually have a bachelor's degree in human resources, business, or a related field." 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. Accordingly, as the *Handbook* indicates that working as a human resources specialist 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 qualifying as a specialty occupation.

Further, this passage of the *Handbook* indicates that a variety of educational backgrounds, including a high school diploma and several years of work experience, are sufficient minimum education for entry into the occupation, particularly those positions that include interviewing and recruiting duties such as the position proffered in this matter. See *id.* The *Handbook* reports that "the level of education and experience required to become a human resources specialist varies by position and employer." *Id.* Therefore, 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 the occupation.

In response to the RFE, counsel asserted that the "[b]eneficiary's job duties classify the position under O*NET [Occupational Information Network] Code 13-1071, Human Resource Specialists, which is assigned a job zone of 4, which encompass a Specific Vocational Preparation (SVP) value range from 7.0 to 8.0, and specifies that most occupations in this category would require applicants to possess a four-year bachelor's degree." Counsel further claimed that the "SVP rating of 7.0 to 8.0 further suggests that individuals in this position would have at least four years of college training as well as prior work experience in the field." We note that the Occupational Information Network (O*NET) Summary Report does not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation normally requiring at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Under the subsection entitled "Education," O*NET states that "[m]ost of these occupations require a four-year bachelor's degree, but some do not."⁷ More specifically, "most" is not indicative that a particular position normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, (the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1)), or that a particular position is so specialized and complex as to require knowledge usually associated with attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty (the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4)). Further, as previously noted, USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent that is directly related to the proposed position. Since there must be a close

⁷ For instance, the first definition of "most" in *Webster's New Collegiate College Dictionary* 731 (Third Edition, Hough Mifflin Harcourt 2008) is "[g]reatest in number, quantity, size, or degree." As such, if merely 51% of the positions require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, it could be said that "most" of the positions require such a degree. It cannot be found, therefore, that a particular degree requirement for "most" positions in a given occupation equates to a *normal minimum entry requirement* for that occupation. Instead, a normal minimum entry requirement is one that denotes a standard entry requirement but recognizes that certain, limited exceptions to that standard may exist. To interpret this provision otherwise would run directly contrary to the plain language of the Act, which requires in part "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." Section 214(i)(1) of the Act.

correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a degree without further specification, does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558.

Moreover, O*NET does not state that a degree must be in a *specific specialty*. Thus, a designation of Job Zone Four does not demonstrate that at least a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty* is normally the minimum requirement for entry, and does not, therefore, demonstrate that a position so designated is in a specialty occupation as defined in section 214(i)(1) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

Furthermore, we note that the assignment of an SVP rating of 7 or 8 is not indicative of a specialty occupation. This is obvious upon reading Section II of the *Dictionary of Occupational Title (DOT)*'s Appendix C, Components of the Definition Trailer, which addresses the SVP rating system.⁸ The section reads:

II. SPECIFIC VOCATIONAL PREPARATION (SVP)

Specific Vocational Preparation is defined as the amount of lapsed time required by a typical worker to learn the techniques, acquire the information, and develop the facility needed for average performance in a specific job-worker situation.

This training may be acquired in a school, work, military, institutional, or vocational environment. It does not include the orientation time required of a fully qualified worker to become accustomed to the special conditions of any new job. Specific vocational training includes: vocational education, apprenticeship training, in-plant training, on-the-job training, and essential experience in other jobs.

Specific vocational training includes training given in any of the following circumstances:

- a. Vocational education (high school; commercial or shop training; technical school; art school; and that part of college training which is organized around a specific vocational objective);
- b. Apprenticeship training (for apprenticeable jobs only);
- c. In-plant training (organized classroom study provided by an employer);
- d. On-the-job training (serving as learner or trainee on the job under the instruction of a qualified worker);
- e. Essential experience in other jobs (serving in less responsible jobs which lead to

⁸ Section II of the *DOT*'s Appendix C, Components of the Definition Trailer, can be found on the Internet at the website http://www.occupationalinfo.org/appendxc_1.html#II.

the higher grade job or serving in other jobs which qualify).

The following is an explanation of the various levels of specific vocational preparation:

Level	Time
1	Short demonstration only
2	Anything beyond short demonstration up to and including 1 month
3	Over 1 month up to and including 3 months
4	Over 3 months up to and including 6 months
5	Over 6 months up to and including 1 year
6	Over 1 year up to and including 2 years
7	Over 2 years up to and including 4 years
8	Over 4 years up to and including 10 years
9	Over 10 years

Note: The levels of this scale are mutually exclusive and do not overlap.

Thus, an SVP rating of 7 to 8 does not indicate that at least a four-year bachelor's degree is required, or more importantly, that such a degree must be in a specific specialty directly related to the duties and responsibilities of that occupation. Therefore, the O*NET information is not probative of the proffered position being a specialty occupation.

In response to the RFE and also on appeal, counsel refers to the 2012-2013 edition of the *Handbook* to indicate that the *Handbook* states that "most positions require that applicants have a bachelor's degree." Counsel further claims that "the Webster's definition of 'most' is 'the greatest in quantity, extent to degree' or 'the majority,'" that "[t]hese definitions, therefore, mean more than fifty percent" and that "the Petitioner had demonstrated that a bachelor's degree...is normally the minimum required for entry."

However, we find that this statement does not support the view that *any* job in the field qualifies as a specialty occupation. As previously discussed, "most" is not indicative that a particular position within the wide spectrum of human resources specialist jobs normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that the proffered position falls under an occupational category for which the *Handbook* (or other objective, 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 by the petitioner 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 first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, we will review 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.

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. at 1102).

As previously discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* (or other objective, authoritative source), reports a standard, industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Thus, we incorporate by reference the previous discussion on the matter. The petitioner did not submit documentation from the industry's professional association indicating that it has made a degree a minimum entry requirement.

In the Form I-129, the petitioner stated that it is retailer with 47 employees. The petitioner also reported its gross annual income as approximately \$12 million and its net annual income as \$322,776. The petitioner designated its business operations under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 447110 – "Gasoline Stations with Convenience Stores." The U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau website describes this NAICS code as follows:

This industry comprises establishments engaged in retailing automotive fuels (e.g., diesel fuel, gasohol, gasoline) in combination with convenience store or food mart items. These establishments can either be in a convenience store (i.e., food mart) setting or a gasoline station setting. These establishments may also provide automotive repair services.

See U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S Census Bureau, 2012 NAICS Definition, 447110 – Gasoline Stations with Convenience Stores on the Internet at <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch> (last visited July 24, 2014).

For the petitioner to establish that an organization is similar, it must demonstrate that it shares the same general characteristics with the advertising organization. Without such evidence, documentation submitted by a petitioner is generally outside the scope of consideration for this criterion, which encompasses only organizations that are similar to the petitioner. When determining whether the petitioner and the advertising organization 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 to claim that an organization is similar and in the same industry without providing a legitimate basis for such an assertion.

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 example, the petitioner submitted advertisements for [REDACTED]. However, the advertisements do not have sufficient information regarding the employer's business operations to conduct legitimate comparison. The petitioner did not provide any additional information to establish that the advertising company and the petitioner share the same general characteristics, such as evidence that the organizations are similar in size or scope of business.

Moreover, it appears that the advertised positions are not parallel to the proffered position. Specifically, the advertised position for [REDACTED] is for a human resource manager and the duties include "coaching for all regional management." While the petitioner designated the proffered position as a Level IV, which "generally [has] management and/or supervisory responsibilities," the petitioner did not indicate that the proffered position corresponds to the occupational category, "Human Resources Manager."⁹

Further, contrary to the purpose for which the advertisement was submitted, the postings do not establish that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required for the position. For example, [REDACTED] requires a "Bachelor's degree (B.S.) in Business Management or equivalent experience in a related field," [REDACTED] requires "a bachelor's degree and at least 2 years of Human Resource Generalist experience," and [REDACTED] requires "BA/BS degree in business or related studies required." Upon review, we find that the advertisements do not indicate that a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty* that is directly related to the occupation is required. As discussed, 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 position. Again, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business management or business, 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.*, 484 F.3d at 147.

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, as 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, not every deficit of every job posting has been addressed.

⁹ We note that for the occupational category "Human Resources Managers"-SOC (ONET/OES Code) 11-3121 at Level IV, the prevailing wage in the intended area of employment is \$109,221 per year. For more information, see the Foreign Labor Certification Data Center Online Wage Library at <http://www.flcdatacenter.com/OesQuickResults.aspx?code=11-3121&area=5100004&year=13&source=1> (last visited July 24, 2014).

The job advertisements do not establish that similar organizations to the petitioner routinely employ individuals with degrees in a specific specialty, in parallel positions in the petitioner's industry. Further, it must be noted that even if all of the job postings indicated that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations (which they do not), the petitioner fails to demonstrate what statistically valid inferences, if any, can be drawn from the advertisements with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar organizations.¹⁰

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) 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).

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

In support of its assertion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the petitioner submitted various documents, including information regarding the proffered position and evidence regarding its business operations. For example, the submission included the following:

- Payroll Labor Analysis Report
- Photographs of [REDACTED] gas station and convenience store

¹⁰ According to the *Handbook's* detailed statistics on human resources specialists and labor relations specialists, there were approximately 495,500 persons employed as human resource specialists and labor relations specialists in 2012. *Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., available at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/human-resources-specialists-and-labor-relations-specialists.htm#tab-6> (last accessed July 24, 2014). Based on the size of this relevant study population, the petitioner fails to demonstrate what statistically valid inferences, if any, can be drawn from the job postings with regard to the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar organizations. 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 organizations similar to the petitioner in its industry, for positions parallel to the proffered position, commonly require at least a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, it cannot be found that just these postings (which appear to have been consciously selected) could credibly refute the statistics-based findings of the *Handbook* published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that such a position does not normally require at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for entry into the occupation in the United States.

- Form 1040, U.S. Individual Income Tax Return
- Individual Store Franchise Agreement

While the petitioner submitted documents regarding its business operations, the petitioner did not explain how the documents relate to the beneficiary's duties, and the evidence does not establish the relative complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. For example, in the support letter, the petitioner claimed that it "currently employs 47 employees to staff the five locations he operates, and rotates employees between day, evening, and midnight shifts as well as each of the give different locations." The petitioner further indicate that "[i]n light of the complexity of his operations and personnel allocations, the Petitioner needs the Human Resource Specialist to monitor and adjust staff requirements and address issues immediately as they arise."

However, the record of proceeding does not contain sufficient evidence to support the beneficiary's claims regarding his business operations. For example, while the petitioner lists five locations with addresses on its letterhead, there is no documentary evidence to that support that the petitioner operates five different retail stores at such locations. According to the tax return submitted on appeal, the petitioner, [REDACTED] owns a [REDACTED] VA, which is the address provided for the petitioner. There is no evidence in the record to establish that additional retail stores are incorporated under the petitioner. Further, while the tax return lists some rental properties under the petitioner, the addresses of the rental properties do not match the addresses provided for additional retail stores printed on the letterhead. Moreover, while several pages of pay roll labor analysis were provided, they do not sufficiently establish that the petitioner owns five stores. While the analysis lists the company name as the petitioner, the location is identified by a number code, which does not sufficiently define the location of the business and match the locations listed on the letterhead. In addition, while the pay roll further lists the names of people, hours, pay rate, and amount paid, it does not sufficiently demonstrate that the names of people listed are employed by the petitioner and paid wages by the petitioner at multiple locations as claimed by the petitioner.

Further, counsel and the petitioner also claim that the "Petitioner is in the process of expanding his business to two more store locations in [REDACTED] Virginia area." On appeal, counsel claims that the petitioner "seeks to hire a qualified Human Resource Specialist so that he may focus on expanding his business while ensuring the continued success of his current operations, and in anticipation of the increased human resources needs of his operations as he expands his business and requires additional staff. However, the petitioner or counsel did not provide evidence to substantiate their claims. 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'r 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972)).

The petitioner fails to sufficiently support its claims and develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position of a human resource specialist. More specifically, the petitioner failed to demonstrate how the duties of a human resource specialist as described in the record 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. Although in response to the RFE, the petitioner mentioned several courses that the beneficiary has taken that it claims are relevant, it must be noted that the petitioner 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 required, in performing certain duties of the proffered 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.

We observe that the petitioner has indicated that the beneficiary is well qualified for the position. In addition to his educational background, including two masters' degrees in computer related fields, the petitioner claims that the beneficiary was employed as an assistant team lead/recruiter in India where he was responsible for human resources functions. 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. Consequently, as the petitioner fails 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, 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. We usually review the petitioner's past recruiting and hiring practices, as well as information regarding employees who previously held the position.

To satisfy 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. In the instant case, the record does not establish 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").

The petitioner stated in the Form I-129 petition that it has approximately 47 employees and that it was established in 2005. In response to the RFE, counsel claimed that the proffered position is "a newly created 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.

The petitioner has not provided sufficient 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 petitioner provided information regarding the proffered position and its business operations, including the documentation previously outlined. While the evidence provides some insights into the petitioner's business activities, the documents do not establish that the nature of the specific duties of the proffered position 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.

On appeal, counsel asserts that the petitioner "has demonstrated that the complexity of the duties of the proffered position, especially in light of the complexity of his business operations and the upcoming expansion of such operations, is such that the knowledge required to perform these duties is normally associated with the attainment of a Bachelor's degree." However, as mentioned, complexity of the petitioner's operations is not sufficiently established through documentary evidence. With regard to the petitioner's expansion plans, it must be noted that the petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1). As previously stated by the Service "the H-1B classification is not intended . . . for employers to bring in temporary foreign workers to meet possible workforce needs arising from potential business expansions or the expectation of potential new customers or contracts." *See* 63 Fed. Reg. 30419, 30419 - 30420 (June 4, 1998).

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

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

V. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by us even if the service center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

Moreover, when we deny a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it shows that we abused our discretion with respect to all of our enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043, *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683.

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.