(b)(6)

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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

DATE: APR 2 7 2015

PETITION RECEIPT#:

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 is the non-precedent decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for your case.

If you believe we incorrectly decided your case, you may file a motion requesting us to reconsider our decision and/or reopen the proceeding. The requirements for motions are located at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Motions must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) **within 33 days of the date of this decision**. The Form I-290B web page (www.uscis.gov/i-290b) contains the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. **Please do not mail any motions directly to the AAO**.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center 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.

I. INTRODUCTION

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a three-employee software consulting services company[1] established in In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a "Computer Programmer" position at a salary of $55,000 per year,[2] 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 August 4, 2014, concluding that the evidence of record did not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation position. On September 3, 2014, the petitioner filed the instant timely appeal.

The record of proceeding before us contains the following: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's letter denying the petition; and (5) the Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, and supporting documentation.

Upon review of the entire record of proceeding, we find that the evidence of record does not overcome the director's basis for denying this petition. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

In the exercise of our administrative review in this matter, as in all matters that come within our purview, we follow the preponderance of the evidence standard as specified in the controlling precedent decision, *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369 (AAO 2010), unless the law specifically provides that a different standard applies. In pertinent part, that decision states the following:

---

[1] The petitioner provided a North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code of 541511 "Custom Computer Programming Services" U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, North American Industry Classification System, 2012 NAICS Definition http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch?code=541511&search=2012 (last visited April 15, 2015).

[2] The Labor Condition Application (LCA) submitted by the petitioner in support of the petition was certified for use with a job prospect within the "Computer Programmer" occupational classification, SOC (O*NET/OES) Code 15-1131, and a Level I (entry-level) prevailing wage rate, the lowest of the four assignable wage-levels.

> 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" 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.

Id. at 375-76.

We conduct our review of service center decisions on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d at 145. In doing so, as noted above, we apply the preponderance of the evidence standard as outlined in *Matter of Chawathe.* Upon our review of the present matter pursuant to that standard, however, we find that the evidence in the record of proceeding does not support counsel's contentions that the evidence of record requires that the petition at issue be approved. Applying the preponderance of the evidence standard as stated in *Matter of Chawathe*, we find that the director's ground for denial was correct. Upon our review of the entire record of proceeding, and with close attention and due regard to all of the evidence, separately and in the aggregate, submitted in support of this petition, we find that the evidence of record does not establish that the claim of a proffer of a specialty occupation position is "more likely than not" or "probably" true. In other words, as the evidentiary analysis of this decision will reflect, the petitioner has not submitted relevant, probative, and credible evidence that leads us to believe that the petitioner's claim that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation is "more likely than not" or "probably" true.

III. SPECIALTY OCCUPATION

A. Law

To meet the petitioner's burden of proof in establishing the proffered position as a specialty occupation, the evidence of record must establish that the employment the petitioner is offering to the beneficiary meets the following 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 result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as providing supplemental criteria that must be met in accordance with, and not as alternatives to, the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

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

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

B. The Proffered Position

In its support letter, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary will be responsible for the following duties at the end-client's location:

- Perform business and technical requirement review, with Business Systems Analysts and Application architects.
- Prepare the Low-level, High-Level, technical and deployment specifications[.]
- Develop Web application using HTML5, CSS and also Bootstrap from Github for powerful front-end framework and faster web-development[.]
- Use JQuery to reduce code and implement and manage complex sets of data[.]
- Define Interfaces and develop WCF Service methods[.]
- Develop system using Asp.Net MVC4 (Razor) C#, Visual Studio 2012 and SQL and query optimization.
- Query tuning and performance optimization.
- Responsible for fixing the Connection and Memory Leaks in the application[.]
- Acquiring, manipulation, and analyzing data and reporting results.
- Develop and maintain data flow models, provides a consistent base-line for prioritizing projects and allocating resources, and evaluate different risk level opportunities for Users.

The petitioner also submitted a letter, dated March 18, 2014, from the end-client listing the same duties quoted above. The end-client stated that the proffered position "requires a Master's Degree in Engineering specializing in the Healthcare and Medical Software Programming, with experience in a combination of technologies . . . and a good understanding of Bio-Medical Sciences."

C. Analysis

To make our determination as to whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, we will turn to the supplemental, additional criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

As a preliminary matter, we note that the evidence of record does not present the proffered position and its constituent duties in sufficient detail to establish either the substantive nature of the work that the beneficiary would perform in the proffered position or any particular educational or education-equivalent level of any body of highly specialized knowledge in any specific specialty that the beneficiary would have to apply to perform the position.

When determining whether a position is a specialty occupation, we must look at the nature of the business offering the employment and the description of the specific duties of the position as it relates to the particular employer. To ascertain the intent of a petitioner, USCIS looks to the Form I-129 and the documents filed in support of the petition. It is only in this manner that the agency can determine the exact position proffered, the location of employment, the proffered wage, et cetera. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(9)(i), the director has the responsibility to consider all of the evidence submitted by a petitioner and such other evidence that he or she may independently require to assist his or her adjudication. Further, 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."

Thus, a crucial aspect of this matter is whether the petitioner has adequately described the duties of the proffered position, such that USCIS may discern the nature of the position and whether the position requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge attained through at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific discipline, or its equivalent. We find that the petitioner has not done so.

The petitioner describes the proffered position and its duties in relatively abstract terms of generalized functions. For instance, the petitioner states that the beneficiary will "[d]evelop Web applications" and "[d]evelop system[s]" without specifying the type of application or system in relation to the end-client's business operations. This is again illustrated by the petitioner's statement that the beneficiary's duties will include "[a]cquiring, manipulating, and analyzing data and reporting results." The petitioner does not explain how the beneficiary will acquire data, how he will manipulate the acquired data, the type of analysis he will perform, and to whom he will report the results. Further, the petitioner's statements do not illuminate the substantive application of knowledge involved or any particular educational attainment associated with such application. This type of generalized description may be appropriate when defining the range of duties that may be performed within an occupational category, but it does not adequately convey the substantive work that the beneficiary will perform within the petitioner's business operations and, thus, cannot be relied upon by a petitioner when discussing the duties attached to specific employment. In establishing a position as a specialty occupation, a petitioner must describe the specific duties and responsibilities to be performed by a beneficiary in the context of the petitioner's business operations, demonstrate that a legitimate need for an employee exists, and substantiate that it has H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary for the period of employment requested in the petition.

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 (1) the actual work that the beneficiary would perform, (2) the complexity, uniqueness and/or specialization of the tasks, and/or (3) the correlation between that work and a need for a particular level education of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty.

In the instant case, the petitioner has not described the proffered position with sufficient detail to determine that the minimum requirements are a bachelor's degree in a specialized field of study. It is incumbent on the petitioner to provide sufficient evidence to establish that the particular position that it proffers would necessitate services at a level requiring both the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge and the attainment of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. When "any person makes an application for a visa or any other document required for entry, or makes an application for admission, [. . .] the burden of proof shall be upon such person to establish that he is eligible" for such benefit. Section 291 of the Act; *see also Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm'r 1972).

We will nevertheless analyze the duties and the evidence of record to determine whether the proffered position as described would qualify as a specialty occupation. To that end and to make our determination as to whether the employment described above qualifies as a specialty occupation, we turn first to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*1*), which is satisfied by establishing that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of the petition.

We recognize the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (the *Handbook*) as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations it addresses.[3] In the instant case, the petitioner provided an LCA in support of the petition stating that the occupational classification for the proffered position is "Computer Programmer." The *Handbook* states the following with regard to the duties of positions falling within the "Computer Programmers" occupational category:

> Computer programmers write code to create software programs. They turn the program designs created by software developers and engineers into instructions that a computer can follow. Programmers must debug the programs—that is, test them to ensure that they produce the expected results. If a program does not work correctly, they check the code for mistakes and fix them.
>
> **Duties**
>
> Computer programmers typically do the following:
>
> - Write programs in a variety of computer languages, such as C++ and Java
> - Update and expand existing programs
> - Debug programs by testing for and fixing errors
> - Build and use computer-assisted software engineering (CASE) tools to automate the writing of some code
> - Use code libraries, which are collections of independent lines of code, to simplify the writing
>
> Programmers work closely with software developers, and in some businesses, their duties overlap. When this happens, programmers can do work that is typical of developers, such as designing the program. This entails initially planning the software, creating models and flowcharts detailing how the code is to be written, writing and debugging code, and designing an application or systems interface.

[3] The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed online at http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/. Our references to the *Handbook* are from the 2014-15 edition available online.

> Some programs are relatively simple and usually take a few days to write, such as creating mobile applications for cell phones. Other programs, like computer operating systems, are more complex and can take a year or more to complete.
>
> Software-as-a-service (SaaS), which consists of applications provided through the Internet, is a growing field. Although programmers typically need to rewrite their programs to work on different systems platforms such as Windows or OS X, applications created using SaaS work on all platforms. That is why programmers writing for software-as-a-service applications may not have to update as much code as other programmers and can instead spend more time writing new programs.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., "Computer Programmer," http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-programmers.htm#tab-2 (last visited April 15, 2015).

The *Handbook* states the following with regard to the educational requirements necessary for entrance into this field:

> Most computer programmers have a bachelor's degree in computer science or a related subject; however, some employers hire workers with an associate's degree. Most programmers specialize in a few programming languages.
>
> **Education**
>
> Most computer programmers have a bachelor's degree; however, some employers hire workers who have an associate's degree. Most programmers get a degree in computer science or a related subject. Programmers who work in specific fields, such as healthcare or accounting, may take classes in that field to supplement their degree in computer programming. In addition, employers value experience, which many students gain through internships.
>
> Most programmers learn only a few computer languages while in school. However, a computer science degree gives students the skills needed to learn new computer languages easily. During their classes, students receive hands-on experience writing code, debugging programs, and doing many other tasks that they will perform on the job.
>
> To keep up with changing technology, computer programmers may take continuing education and professional development seminars to learn new programming languages or about upgrades to programming languages they already know.

Id. at http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-programmers.htm#tab-4 (last visited April 15, 2015).

The *Handbook* does not report that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into positions within this occupational category. This passage of the *Handbook* reports that most computer programmers have a bachelor's degrees, but the *Handbook* continues by indicating that some employers hire individuals who have an associate's degree. Accordingly, as the *Handbook* indicates that working as a computer programmer does not normally require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into the occupation, the *Handbook* does not support the proffered position as being a specialty occupation.

Also, upon review of the totality of the evidence in the entire record of proceeding, we conclude that the evidence of the record of proceeding has not established that the proffered position falls within an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, indicates that a requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally required for entry into the occupation. Furthermore, the duties and requirements of the proffered position as described in the record of proceeding do not indicate that the particular position that is the subject of this petition is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry.

Finally, we again note that the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a job prospect with a wage-level that is only appropriate for a comparatively low position relative to others within its occupation, which signifies that the beneficiary is expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment.[4]

[4] The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* (available at http://www.foreignlaborcert. doleta.gov/ pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf (last visited April 15, 2015)) issued by DOL states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

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

The proposed duties' level of complexity, uniqueness, and specialization, as well as the level of independent judgment and occupational understanding required to perform them, are questionable, as the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a Level I position. The LCA's wage-level is appropriate for a proffered position that is a low-level position relative to others within the occupation. In accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, by submitting an LCA with a Level I wage rate, the petitioner effectively attests that the beneficiary is only required to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment.

As the evidence in the record of proceeding does not establish that at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of this petition, evidence of record does not satisfy the criterion described at 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 for positions that are identifiable as being (1) in the petitioner's industry, (2) parallel to the proffered position, and also (3) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

Here and as already discussed, the evidence of record does not establish that the petitioner's proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Also, there are no submissions from professional associations in the petitioner's industry attesting that individuals employed in positions parallel to the proffered position are routinely required to have a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into those positions. Nor does the record of proceeding contain any other evidence relevant to this alternative prong.

Thus, based upon a complete review of the record, we find that the petitioner has not established that a requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common for positions that are identifiable as being (1) in the petitioner's industry, (2) parallel to the proffered position, and also (3) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner. Thus, for the reasons discussed above, the petitioner has not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*).

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 the instant case, the evidence of record does not credibly demonstrate relative complexity or uniqueness as aspects of the proffered position. Specifically, it is unclear how the computer programmer position, as described, necessitates the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a person who has attained a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is required to perform them. More specifically, the petitioner did not demonstrate how the duties 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 data analyst position, the petitioner did not 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 petitioner's proffered position.

This is further evidenced by the LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of the instant petition. Again, we incorporate by reference and reiterate our earlier discussion that the LCA indicates the position is a low-level (entry-level) position relative to others within the occupation. Based upon the wage rate, the beneficiary is only required to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. 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."[5]

Finally, we observe that the petitioner has indicated that the beneficiary's experience and his educational background make him qualified for 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 does not establish which of the proposed duties, if any, would render the proffered position so complex or unique as to be distinguishable from those of similar but non-degreed or non-specialty degreed employment. Again, the petitioner did not 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.

For all of these reasons, it cannot be concluded that the evidence of record satisfies 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 normally review 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 the imposition of a degree requirement by the petitioner 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.

[5] For additional information regarding wage levels as defined by DOL, *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.

We note that the petitioner claims repeatedly that the duties of the proffered position can only be employed by a degreed individual. While a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a degree in a specific specialty, 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 employer 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 387. In other words, if a petitioner's degree requirement is only symbolic and 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* section 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "specialty occupation"). The record does not contain sufficient documentary evidence demonstrating a hiring history of the petitioner for the proffered position.[6] As the record of proceeding does not demonstrate that the petitioner normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for the proffered position, it does not satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*3*).

Next, we find that the evidence of record does not satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*4*), which requires the petitioner to establish that the nature of the proffered position's 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 the specific specialty or its equivalent.

Again, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position's duties. In other words, the proposed duties have not been described with sufficient specificity to show that their nature is more specialized and complex than computer programmer positions whose duties are not of a nature so specialized and complex that their performance requires knowledge usually associated with a degree in a specific specialty. With regard to the specific duties of the position proffered here, we find that the record of proceeding lacks sufficient, credible evidence establishing that they are so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent.

Moreover, we incorporate our earlier discussion regarding the wage-level designation on the LCA, which is appropriate for duties whose nature is less complex and specialized than required to satisfy

[6] The record contains a Form I-797, Notice of Action, a supporting letter, and an LCA indicating another beneficiary for the petitioner was approved for H-1B status for the position of "Programmer Analyst" within the "Computer Systems Analysts" occupational category (SOC code 15-1121). This evidence is insufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's hiring history as the positions do not appear to be the same. The petitioner also submitted a list of its employees, their work locations, and wage information for some of the employees. This information is insufficient to demonstrate that the positions the listed employees hold are the same as the proffered position.

this criterion. We find that both on its own terms and also in comparison with the two higher wage-levels that can be designated in an LCA, by the submission of an LCA certified for a wage-level I (entry-level), the petitioner effectively attests that the proposed duties are of relatively low complexity as compared to others within the same occupational category. This fact is materially inconsistent with the level of complexity required by this criterion.

As earlier noted, the *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* issued by DOL states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

> **Level I** (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the employer's methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and results expected. Their work is closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. Statements that the job offer is for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship are indicators that a Level I wage should be considered [emphasis in original].[7]

The pertinent guidance from DOL, at page 7 of its *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the next higher wage-level as follows:

> **Level II** (qualified) wage rates are assigned to job offers for qualified employees who have attained, either through education or experience, a good understanding of the occupation. They perform moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment. An indicator that the job request warrants a wage determination at Level II would be a requirement for years of education and/or experience that are generally required as described in the O*NET Job Zones.

Id.

The above descriptive summary indicates that even this higher-than-designated wage level is appropriate for only "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment." The fact that this higher-than-here-assigned, Level II wage-rate itself indicates performance of only "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment," is very telling with regard to the relatively low level of complexity imputed to the proffered position by virtue of its Level I wage-rate designation.

[7] 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 (last visited April 15, 2015).

Further, we note the relatively low level of complexity that even this Level II wage-level reflects when compared with the two still-higher LCA wage levels, neither of which was designated on the LCA submitted to support this petition.

The aforementioned *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level III wage designation as follows:

> **Level III** (experienced) wage rates are assigned to job offers for experienced employees who have a sound understanding of the occupation and have attained, either through education or experience, special skills or knowledge. They perform tasks that require exercising judgment and may coordinate the activities of other staff. They may have supervisory authority over those staff. A requirement for years of experience or educational degrees that are at the higher ranges indicated in the O*NET Job Zones would be indicators that a Level III wage should be considered.
>
> Frequently, key words in the job title can be used as indicators that an employer's job offer is for an experienced worker. . . .

Id.

The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level IV wage designation as follows:

> **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.

Id.

Here, we again incorporate our earlier discussion and analysis regarding the implications of the petitioner's submission of an LCA certified for the lowest assignable wage-level. By virtue of this submission, the petitioner effectively attested that the proffered position is a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation, and that, as clear by comparison with DOL's instructive comments about the next higher level (Level II), the proffered position did not even involve "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment" (the level of complexity noted for the next higher wage-level, Level II).

For all of these reasons, the evidence in the record of proceeding fails to establish that the proposed duties meet the specialization and complexity threshold at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)*(4)*.

Counsel refers to an unpublished decision in which we determined that "the petitioner is an employment contractor, [and] an itinerary must be provided." However, counsel has furnished no evidence to establish that the facts of the instant petition are analogous to those in the unpublished decision. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that our precedent decisions are binding on all USCIS employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding.

As the evidence of record does not satisfy at least one of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it cannot be found that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will be denied on this basis.

IV. EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIP

Beyond the decision of the director, the petition cannot be approved because the petitioner has not demonstrated that it qualifies as a United States employer. As detailed above, the record of proceeding lacks sufficient documentation evidencing the specific duties the beneficiary would perform for the period of time requested and how the petitioner would supervise the beneficiary while he performs these duties at the end-client's place of business. Given this specific lack of evidence, the petitioner has not corroborated who has or will have actual control over the beneficiary's work or duties, or the condition and scope of the beneficiary's services. In other words, the evidence of record of proceeding has not established that the petitioner will have and maintain the requisite employer-employee relationship with the beneficiary for the duration of the requested employment period. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "United States employer" and requiring the petitioner to engage the beneficiary to work such that it will have and maintain an employer-employee relationship with respect to the sponsored H-1B nonimmigrant worker). Again and as previously discussed, there is insufficient evidence detailing the specific projects to be performed by the beneficiary, or how the petitioner would supervise and have actual control over the beneficiary's work or duties. Therefore, the petition cannot be approved for this additional reason.

V. DENIAL OF CHANGE OF STATUS AND EXTENSION OF STAY

Finally, the regulations do not provide for an appeal from a denial of an extension of stay. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.1(c)(5). Similarly, the regulations do not provide for an appeal from a denial of a request to change status. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 248.3(g). Further, the authority to adjudicate appeals is delegated to us by the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) pursuant to the authority vested in him through the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-296. *See* DHS Delegation Number 0150.1 (effective March 1, 2003); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 2.1 (2003). We exercise appellate jurisdiction over the matters described at 8 C.F.R. § 103.1(f)(3)(iii) (as in effect on February 28, 2003), with one exception - petitions for approval of schools under § 214.3 are now the responsibility of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Appeals from denials of requests to change status

and appeals from denials of requests for extension of stay are not listed as matters over which we have jurisdiction, and this portion of the petitioner's appeal must be rejected for this reason.

VI. 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 145 (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 the enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1037, *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683; *see also BDPCS, Inc. v. Fed. Communications Comm'n*, 351 F.3d 1177, 1183 (D.C. Cir. 2003) ("When an agency offers multiple grounds for a decision, we will affirm the agency so long as any one of the grounds is valid, unless it is demonstrated that the agency would not have acted on that basis if the alternative grounds were unavailable.").

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

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

[8] As the grounds discussed above are dispositive of the petitioner's eligibility for the benefit sought in this matter, we will not address and will instead reserve our determination on the additional issues and deficiencies that we observe in the record of proceeding with regard to the approval of the H-1B petition.