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

(b)(6)

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

DATE: AUG 2 4 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:

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 Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On the Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129), the petitioner describes itself as an information technology services business established in In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a computer programmer position, the petitioner seeks to classify her 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 reviewed the record of proceeding and determined that the petitioner did not establish eligibility for the benefit sought. Specifically, the Director stated that the petitioner had not established that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. The Director denied the petition.

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 Director's decision; and (5) the Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) and supporting documentation. We reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing our decision.[1]

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

II. SPECIALTY OCCUPATION

To meet its burden of proof in establishing the proffered position as a specialty occupation, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

A. Legal Framework

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

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

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

[1] We conduct appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

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

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must 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. Analysis

In the support letter,[2] the petitioner states that the beneficiary will perform the following job duties in the proffered position:[3]

---

[2] The petitioner mistakenly and repeatedly references the beneficiary in the masculine pronoun case in the support letter. The record provides no explanation for this inconsistency. Thus, we must question the accuracy of this document and whether the information provided is correctly attributed to this particular position and beneficiary.

[3] The wording of the duties provided by the petitioner for the proffered position are taken almost verbatim from the Occupational Information Network (O*NET) OnLine and the *Dictionary of Occupational Title's* list of tasks associated with computer programmer and systems analyst positions. When the duties of a proffered position involve more than one occupational category, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) provides guidance for selecting the most relevant O*NET code classification. The "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance" states the following:

> In determining the *nature of the job offer*, the first order is to review the requirements of the employer's job offer and determine the appropriate occupational classification. The O*NET description that corresponds to the employer's job offer shall be used to identify the appropriate occupational classification . . . . If the employer's job opportunity has worker requirements described in a combination of O*NET occupations, [the determiner] should

- Correct errors by making appropriate changes and rechecking the program to ensure that the desired results are produced.
- Conduct trial runs of programs and software applications to be sure they will produce the desired information and that the instructions are correct.
- Write, update, and maintain computer programs or software packages to handle specific jobs such as tracking inventory, storing or retrieving data, or controlling other equipment.
- Write, analyze, review, and rewrite programs, using workflow chart and diagram, and applying knowledge of computer capabilities, subject matter, and symbolic logic.
- Perform or direct revision, repair, or expansion of existing programs to increase operating efficiency or adapt to new requirements.
- Consult with managerial, engineering, and technical personnel to clarify program intent, identify problems, and suggest changes.
- Perform systems analysis and programming tasks to maintain and control the use of computer systems software as a systems programmer.
- Compile and write documentation of program development and subsequent revisions, inserting comments in the coded instructions so others can understand the program.
- Prepare detailed workflow charts and diagrams that describe input, output, and logical operation, and convert them into a series of instructions coded in a computer language.

> default directly to the relevant O*NET-SOC occupational code for the highest paying occupation. For example, if the employer's job offer is for an engineer-pilot, [the determiner] shall use the education, skill and experience levels for the higher paying occupation when making the wage level determination.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Emp't & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf.

Thus, if the petitioner believed its position was described as a combination of occupations, then according to DOL guidance the petitioner should have chosen the relevant occupational code for the highest paying occupation. The prevailing wage for "Computer Programmers" is significantly lower than the prevailing wage for "Computer Systems Analysts."

- Consult with and assist computer operators or system analysts to define and resolve problems in running computer programs.

In addition to the above mentioned duties, Beneficiary will identify problems, study existing systems to evaluate effectiveness and develop new systems to improve production of workflow. She will write a detailed description of user needs, program functions, and steps required to develop or modify computer program. Beneficiary will also review computer system capabilities, workflow and scheduling limitation to determine whether the program can be changed with the existing system.

Beneficiary will assist in developing application software on specific needs. She will provide technical evaluation of new products, assess time estimation and provide technical support within the organization.

ii) Maintenance and Technical Duties

Beneficiary will be responsible for trouble shooting, installation and design and development of software applications. She will maintain thorough and accurate documentation on all application systems and adhere to established programming and documentation standards.

iii) Documentation and Reporting Duties

Beneficiary will prepare flow charts and diagrams to illustrate the sequence of steps that programs follow to describe logical operations involved by making use of his [*sic*] knowledge of computers and business management. Beneficiary will also prepare manuals to describe installation and operating procedures.

iv) Non-Technical Description of Job Duties

In layperson terms, Beneficiary will enter program codes into the computer systems and enter commands into the computer to run and test the programs. She will replace, delete or modify codes to correct errors. She will provide technical support, solve problems and troubleshoot systems.

She will specialize in developing programs for specific applications to certain industries. She will be involved in systems integration, debugging, troubleshooting and installation. Beneficiary will offer solutions for various software and hardware problems and compatibility of various systems.

The Beneficiary will also be responsible for updating existing software systems and updating management on new software that is developed. Beneficiary will maintain records to document various steps in the programming process.

In addition, the petitioner states that the proffered position requires "a Bachelor's degree in Science, computer science, computer engineering, Computer Applications, electronics, engineering, physical sciences or equivalent."

Thereafter, in response to the RFE, the petitioner states that the "[b]eneficiary is being assigned to a[n] In-House project called ."[4] In addition, the petitioner changed the job description. More specifically, the petitioner states that the beneficiary would be responsible for the following duties in the proffered position:

> [The] beneficiary will be responsible for implementing Application functionality by writing application programs. She will be taking business and functional specifications (including process workflows, logical flows, etc.) as input and developing application program code ***wherein she will spend 25% of her weekly time.*** She will be fixing application bugs as reported by the users and modifying the code accordingly. She will be testing the fixes made to ensure that the implemented functionality is correct and correct code outputs are being produced ***wherein she will spend 20% of her weekly time.*** Beneficiary will then be extending current application code to implement the new enhancements under review ***wherein she will spend 10% of her weekly time.*** She will generate Audit trail reports of user/licensee information for the Accounts department. She will also review, fine tune, and optimize existing code for performance and efficiency ***wherein she will spend 20% of her weekly time.*** She will implement code to extract and migrate data from a variety of database platforms (ex: oracle, sql server) and raw data formats (ex: excel, text) ***wherein she will spend 15% of her weekly time.*** She will also analyze and write SQL program scripts to automate system maintenance related tasks ***wherein she will spend 10% of her weekly time.*** In order to perform these duties, beneficiary will apply the theories and principles of computer science and electronic engineering to review the software program for . that may need rewriting, using workflow chart and diagram. Beneficiary would periodically correct errors by making appropriate changes to program and rechecking the program to ensure that the desired results are produced. Beneficiary would also document entire software development, changes to software, insert comments into software code, and prepare documentation for end-users describing software installation and use.

The petitioner also states that the "educational requirements for the proffered position are [a] Bachelor's degree of Science in Electronic Engineering."

---

[4] Again, in the October 1, 2014 letter, the petitioner mistakenly and repeatedly references the beneficiary in the masculine pronoun case. The record provides no explanation for this inconsistency. Thus, we must question the accuracy of this document and whether the information provided is correctly attributed to this particular position and beneficiary.

When responding to a request for evidence, a petitioner cannot offer a new position to the beneficiary, or materially change a position's title, its level of authority within the organizational hierarchy, its associated job responsibilities, or the requirements of the position. The petitioner must establish that the position offered to the beneficiary when the petition was filed merits classification for the benefit sought. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248, 249 (Reg'l Comm'r 1978). A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1998).

In addition, we find that the petitioner has provided inconsistent information regarding the requirements of the proffered position. The petitioner initially claimed that the position requires a bachelor's degree in science, computer science, computer engineering, mechanical engineering, computer applications, electronics, engineering, physical sciences or its equivalent. However, in response to the RFE, the petitioner stated that the proffered position requires a "Bachelor's degree of Science in Electronic Engineering." No explanation for this inconsistency was provided. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

Again, the petitioner has represented that the position requires a bachelor's degree in science, computer science, computer engineering, mechanical engineering, computer applications, electronics, engineering, physical sciences, and/or electronic engineering. In general, provided the specialties are closely related, e.g., chemistry and biochemistry, a minimum of a bachelor's or higher degree in more than one specialty is recognized as satisfying the "degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent)" requirement of section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act. In such a case, the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" would essentially be the same. Since there must be a close correlation between the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" and the position, however, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in two disparate fields, such as philosophy and engineering, would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in the specific specialty (or its equivalent)," unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties. Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

In other words, while the statutory "the" and the regulatory "a" both denote a singular "specialty," we do not so narrowly interpret these provisions to exclude positions from qualifying as specialty occupations if they permit, as a minimum entry requirement, degrees in more than one closely related specialty. See section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). This also includes even seemingly disparate specialties providing, again, the evidence of record establishes how each acceptable, specific field of study is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position.

As noted, the petitioner has represented that a bachelor's degree in science, computer science, computer engineering, mechanical engineering, computer applications, electronics, engineering, physical sciences, computer information systems and/or electronic engineering is acceptable. However, it must be noted that this list of acceptable credentials includes broad categories that cover numerous and various specialties.[5] Therefore, it is not readily apparent that a degree in any and all of these fields is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position proffered in this matter.

Here, the petitioner, who bears the burden of proof in this proceeding, does not establish either (1) that all of these disciplines are closely related fields, or (2) that all of the fields are directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the proffered position. Absent this evidence, it cannot be found that normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position proffered in this matter is a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, under the petitioner's own standards.

As the evidence of record does not establish how these dissimilar fields of study form either a body of highly specialized knowledge or a specific specialty, or its equivalent, the petitioner's assertion that the job duties of this particular position can be performed by an individual with a bachelor's degree in any of these fields suggests that the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. Therefore, absent probative evidence of a direct relationship between the claimed degrees required and the duties and responsibilities of the position, it cannot be found that the proffered position requires, at best, anything more than a general bachelor's degree. 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'l Comm'r 1972)).

Thus, there are issues that preclude the approval of the petition. Nevertheless, for the purpose of performing a comprehensive analysis of whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, we now turn to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

---

[5] For example, the term "science" is defined as "1a. The observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of natural phenomena. . . . 2. Methodological activity, disciplines, or study <culinary science> 3. An activity that appears to require study and method." WEBSTER'S II NEW COLLEGE DICTIONARY 1012 (2008). *U.S. News and World Report's* guide for colleges designates science programs into various subcategories, including biological sciences, chemistry, earth sciences, math, physics, statistics, as well as social science programs such as criminology, economics, English, history, political science, psychology, and sociology. *See U.S. News and World Report*, available at http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-science-schools (last visited Aug. 19, 2015).

A baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position

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 DOL's *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (the *Handbook*) as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations it addresses.[6] In the instant case, the petitioner provided a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the petition stating that the occupational classification for the proffered position is "Computer Programmers."[7]

---

[6] 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. We hereby incorporate into the record of proceeding the excerpt from the *Handbook* regarding the occupational category "Computer Programmers."

[7] The occupational category designated by a petitioner is considered as an aspect in establishing the general tasks and responsibilities of a proffered position, and USCIS regularly reviews the *Handbook* on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses. However, to satisfy the first criterion, the burden of proof remains on the petitioner to submit sufficient evidence to support a finding that its particular position would normally have a minimum, specialty degree requirement, or its equivalent, for entry.

Further, the petitioner designated the proffered position as a Level I (entry level) position. The "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance" issued by DOL provides a description of the wage levels. A Level I wage rate is described by DOL as follows:

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

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 reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* entitled "Computer Programmers," including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category.[8] The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled "How to Become a Computer Programmer" states the following about this occupation:

> **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.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., Computer Programmers, available at http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-programmers.htm#tab-4 (last visited Aug. 19, 2015).

According to the *Handbook*, the occupation accommodates a wide spectrum of educational credentials, including less than a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. The *Handbook* states that some employers hire workers who have an associate's degree. Furthermore, while the *Handbook's* narrative indicates that most computer programmers obtain a degree (either a bachelor's degree or an associate's degree) in computer science or a related field, the *Handbook* does not report that at least a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty*, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation. The *Handbook* also reports that employers value computer programmers who possess experience, which can be obtained through internships.

Thus, the *Handbook* does not support the claim that the occupational category is one for which normally the minimum requirement for entry is a baccalaureate degree (or higher) in a specific

[8] For additional information regarding the occupational category "Computer Programmers," see U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., Computer Programmers, available at http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-programmers.htm#tab-1 (last visited Aug. 19, 2015).

specialty, or its equivalent.[9] Even if it did (which it does not), to satisfy the first criterion, the petitioner must provide evidence to support a finding that the particular position proffered would normally have such a minimum, specialty degree requirement or its equivalent.

The petitioner also submitted an opinion letter prepared by of In the letter, Mr. states that the computer programmer position requires "a bachelor's-level degree in Computer Science, Information Systems Electronic Engineering, or a related technical field."[10] Upon review, we do not find Mr. letter persuasive.

First, we note that Mr. provides only a generic description of the position's duties, and he does not discuss any of them in meaningful detail. Moreover, the job duties Mr. submits differ from those provided by the petitioner in its support letter. For example, Mr. job description does not mention the project. No explanation was provided as to why the job duties submitted by Mr. do not correspond to those provided by the petitioner.

Nor is there any indication that Mr. possesses any substantive knowledge of the petitioner's proffered position and its business operations. For example, there is no evidence that Mr. visited the petitioner's business and observed the petitioner's employees, interviewed any of them about the nature of their work, or documented the knowledge that they apply on the job. In short, he does not demonstrate or assert in-depth knowledge of the petitioner's specific business operations or how the duties of the position would actually be performed in the context of the petitioner's particular business enterprise.

Furthermore, it does not appear that Mr. is aware that the petitioner designated the proffered position as a Level I (entry) position, the lowest of the four assignable wage-levels, in the LCA.[11] It

---

[9] When the *Handbook* does not support the proposition that a proffered position is one that meets the statutory and regulatory provisions of a specialty occupation, it is incumbent upon the petitioner to provide persuasive evidence that the proffered position more likely than not satisfies this or one of the other three criteria, notwithstanding the absence of the *Handbook*'s support on the issue. It is the petitioner's responsibility to provide probative evidence (e.g., documentation from other objection, authoritative sources) that supports a finding that the particular position in question qualifies as a specialty occupation. Whenever more than one authoritative source exists, an adjudicator will consider and weigh all of the evidence presented to determine whether the particular position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

[10] As previously noted, since there must be a close correlation between the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" and the position, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in disparate fields would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in *the* specific specialty," unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties. Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

[11] As previously discussed, this designation is indicative of a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation and signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation.

appears that Mr. would have found this information relevant for the opinion letter. Without this information, the petitioner has not demonstrated that Mr. possessed the requisite information necessary to adequately assess the nature of the petitioner's position. We consider this a significant omission, as it indicates an incomplete review of the position's essential duties and responsibilities.

We may, in our discretion, use an advisory opinion or statement submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, USCIS is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International,* 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm'r 1988). As a reasonable exercise of our discretion, we find that the advisory opinion letter is not probative evidence of any criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). For efficiency's sake, we hereby incorporate this discussion regarding Mr. Wolk's letter into our analyses of each criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

In the instant case, the duties and requirements of the position as described in the record of proceeding do not indicate that this particular position proffered by the petitioner is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry. Thus, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*1*).

The requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations

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.

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

As previously discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* (or other authoritative source) reports a standard industry-wide requirement 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 submitted copies of job advertisements in support of the assertion that the claimed degree requirement is common to the petitioner's industry in parallel positions among similar

organizations. However, upon review of the documents, we find that the petitioner's reliance on the job announcements is misplaced.

In the Form I-129, the petitioner stated that it is an information technology services business with 14 employees. The petitioner also reported its gross annual income as $2.7 million, and did not provide its net annual income. The petitioner designated its business operations under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 541511.[12] This NAICS code is designated for "Custom Computer Programming Services." The U.S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau website describes this NAICS code as follows: "This U.S. industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in writing, modifying, testing, and supporting software to meet the needs of a particular customer." *See* U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 NAICS Definition, 541511 – Custom Computer Programming Services, available at http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch (last visited Aug. 19, 2015).

For the petitioner to establish that an organization in its industry is also similar under this criterion of the regulations, it must demonstrate that the petitioner and the organization share the same general characteristics. Without such information, evidence submitted by a petitioner is generally outside the scope of consideration for this criterion, which encompasses only organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

We will briefly note that, without more, the job postings do not appear to be from organizations similar to the petitioner.[13] When determining whether the petitioner and the 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. Again, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. at 165.

We further observe that some of the advertisements do not appear to be for parallel positions. For example, the posting from states that the position is for a computer programmer IV, which requires a degree and six to ten years of experience. The announcement from

---

[12] According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is used to classify business establishments according to type of economic activity and, each establishment is classified to an industry according to the primary business activity taking place there. *See* http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/ (last visited Aug. 19, 2015).

[13] The postings include the following: (1) a university; (2) a staffing agency; (3) the State of Montana; (4) a provider of educational, behavioral, and rehabilitative services; (5) a provider of appliance leasing for apartment community residents; and (6) a provider of health care. It does not appear that the advertisements are from companies primarily engaged in information technology services.

also states that the position requires a degree and "a minimum of 5 years as a Computer Programmer." As previously discussed, the petitioner designated its proffered position as a wage level I (entry level) on the LCA. The advertised positions therefore appear to involve more senior positions than the proffered position. More importantly, the petitioner has not sufficiently established that the primary duties and responsibilities of the advertised positions parallel those of the proffered position.

In addition, some postings do not indicate that at least a bachelor's degree in a directly related specific specialty (or its equivalent) is required.[14] For instance, the postings from the following organizations state that a degree is necessary, but they do not state that a specific specialty is required:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-

The job postings suggest, at best, that although a bachelor's degree is sometimes required for computer programmer positions, a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty* (or its equivalent) is not.[15]

---

[14] As discussed, the degree requirement set by the statutory and regulatory framework of the H-1B program is not just a bachelor's or higher degree, but a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the duties of the position. *See* section 214(i)(1)(b) of the Act and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

In addition, since there must be a close correlation between the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" and the position, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in disparate fields would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in *the* specific specialty," unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties. Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

Further, a *desire* or *preference* for a degree in a field is not an indication of a minimum *requirement*.

[15] It must be noted that even if all of the job postings indicated that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations (which they do not), the petitioner does not demonstrate what inferences, if any, can be drawn from these advertisements with regard to determining the common educational requirements for entry into parallel positions in similar organizations. *See generally* Earl Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research* 186-228 (1995).

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.[16] That is, not every deficit of every job posting has been addressed.

In addition, the petitioner submitted letters from and We reviewed the letters in their entirety. However, contrary to the purpose for which the letters were submitted, they are not persuasive in establishing the proffered position as a specialty occupation position under any of the criteria at § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Notably, the letters are almost identical to each other. More specifically, the wording of the letters matches virtually verbatim, including grammatical and punctuation errors. When letters are worded the same (and include identical errors), it indicates that the words are not necessarily those of the authors and may cast some doubt on the letters' validity.

Further, both letters state that "the minimum educational qualification required for the position of Computer Programmer in our Company is a Bachelor's degree and knowledge of computer related skills." The statement does not establish that the organizations require at least a bachelor's degree *in a specific sp*ecialty, or its equivalent. The letters do not establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the authors' industry in parallel positions among similar organizations to the petitioner.

Thus, based upon a complete review of the record, we conclude that 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 (1) in the petitioner's industry, (2) parallel to the proffered position, and also (3) 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*).

As such, even if the job announcements supported the finding that the position required a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent (for organizations in the same industry that are similar to the petitioner), it cannot be found that such a limited number of postings that appear to have been consciously selected outweigh the 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.

[16] The petitioner did not provide any independent evidence of how representative the job postings are of the particular advertising employers' recruiting history for the type of job advertised. As the advertisements are only solicitations for hire, they are not evidence of the actual hiring practices of these employers.

The particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent

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 provided documentation regarding the proffered position and its business operations, including documents regarding the [redacted] project, an employment agreement, an organizational chart, a performance appraisal, and copies of its corporate and financial documents.

Upon review, we find that the petitioner has not sufficiently developed relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position. 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 it may assert are so complex and unique. While a few related courses may be beneficial in performing certain duties of the position, the petitioner has not demonstrated 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 proffered position. The description of the duties does not specifically identify any tasks that are so complex or unique that only a specifically degreed individual could perform them.[17]

The record does not establish which of the duties, if any, of the proffered position would be so complex or unique as to be distinguishable from those of similar but non-degreed or non-specialty degreed employment. The evidence of record does not demonstrate that this position is significantly different from other positions in the occupational category such that it refutes the *Handbook's* information that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is not required for the proffered position.

---

[17] Again, the petitioner designated the proffered position on the LCA at a Level I (entry level) wage level, which is the lowest of four assignable wage-levels. This designation indicates that the proffered position is a position for an employee that is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation; that she will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that she will be closely supervised and her work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that she will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. Such a designation is inconsistent with a claim that the duties of the position are complex and unique as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level III (experienced) or Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage.

The petitioner claims that the beneficiary is well qualified for the position, and references her qualifications. However, the test to establish a position as a specialty occupation is not the education or experience of a proposed beneficiary, but whether the position itself requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The petitioner has not satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*2*).

The employer normally requires a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position

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

To merit approval of the petition under this criterion, the record must establish that a petitioner's imposition of a degree requirement is not merely a matter of preference for high-caliber candidates but is necessitated by performance requirements of the position. While a petitioner may assert that a proffered position requires a specific degree, that statement 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* section 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "specialty occupation").

To satisfy this criterion, the evidence of record must show that the specific performance requirements of the position generated the recruiting and hiring history. A petitioner's perfunctory declaration of a particular educational requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. USCIS must examine the actual employment requirements, and, on the basis of that examination, determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384. In this pursuit, the critical element is not the title of the position, or the fact that an employer has routinely insisted on certain educational standards, but whether performance of the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if USCIS were constrained to recognize a specialty occupation merely because the petitioner has an established practice of demanding certain educational requirements for the proffered position - and without consideration of how a

beneficiary is to be specifically employed - then any alien with a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty could be brought into the United States to perform non-specialty occupations, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate or higher degrees. *See id.* at 388.

The petitioner claims that all of its computer programmers possess a bachelor's degree. In response to the RFE, the petitioner submitted the academic credentials, LCAs, and Wage and Tax Statements (Forms W-2) for 2013 for four individuals. Upon review, we find that the Forms W-2 indicate that the individuals were compensated $54,563.57, $79,999.92, $6,220.86, and $83,076.96 in 2013. The documentation indicates that two individuals were paid significantly higher than the salary offered to the beneficiary, and one individual was paid significantly less than the salary offered to the beneficiary. Thus, this strongly suggests that they are employed in different positions. The petitioner did not provide an explanation for the variances in the wages. Without more, the documentation does not establish that the petitioner satisfied this criterion of the regulations.

Further, the petitioner did not provide the job duties and day-to-day responsibilities for these individuals. The petitioner also did not submit any information regarding the complexity of the job duties, supervisory duties (if any), independent judgment required or the amount of supervision received. Accordingly, it is unclear whether the duties and responsibilities of these individuals were the same or similar to the proffered position.

Moreover, the individuals possess degrees in a range of disciplines, specifically industrial engineering, computer applications, technology, and electronics and communication engineering. The documentation does not establish that the petitioner normally requires a degree *in a specific specialty*, or its equivalent.

Further, the petitioner did not provide the total number of people it has employed to serve in the proffered position. Consequently, it cannot be determined how representative the petitioner's claim regarding *four individuals* is of the petitioner's normal recruiting and hiring practices. Without further information, the submission of *the educational credentials of four individuals* is not persuasive in establishing that the petitioner normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position.

Upon review of the record, we conclude that the petitioner did not provide sufficient documentary evidence to support the assertion that it normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, directly related to the duties of the position. The petitioner has not satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent

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 claims that the nature of the specific duties of the position in the context of its business operations 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. We reviewed the petitioner's statements regarding the proffered position and its business operations. However, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position. That is, the proposed duties have not been described with sufficient specificity to establish that they are more specialized and complex than positions that are not usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.[18]

Although the petitioner asserts that the nature of the specific duties is specialized and complex, the record lacks sufficient evidence to support this claim. Thus, the petitioner has submitted inadequate probative evidence to satisfy the criterion of the regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(*4*).

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has not established 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.

III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons.[19] 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.

---

[18] The petitioner's designation of this position as a Level I, entry-level position undermines its claim that the position is particularly complex, specialized, or unique compared to other positions *within the same occupation*. Nevertheless, it is important to note that a Level I wage-designation does not preclude a proffered position from classification as a specialty occupation. In certain occupations (doctors or lawyers, for example), an entry-level position would still require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for entry. Similarly, however, a Level IV wage-designation would not reflect that an occupation qualifies as a specialty occupation if that higher-level position does not have an entry requirement of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. That is, a position's wage level designation may be a consideration but is not a substitute for a determination of whether a proffered position meets the requirements of section 214(i)(1) of the Act.

[19] As the identified ground of ineligibility is dispositive of the appeal, we will not address any of the additional deficiencies we have identified on appeal.