

(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: JUN 12 2015

PETITION RECEIPT #: [REDACTED]

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

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".

Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Vermont Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In the Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker (Form I-129), the petitioner describes itself as an employment and staffing firm, with two employees, established in [REDACTED]. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a healthcare recruiter position, the petitioner seeks to classify him as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The Director denied the petition, finding that the evidence of record did not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner asserts that the Director's basis for denial was erroneous and contends that it satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

The record of proceeding contains: (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 Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) and supporting documentation. We reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing our decision.¹

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

II. SPECIALITY OCCUPATION

The primary issue is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation.

A. Legal Framework

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

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

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

- (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 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. Proffered Position

As noted above, the petitioner describes itself an employment and staffing firm, established in [REDACTED] and employing two people.² In the letter submitted in support of the instant petition, the petitioner states that it is "principally engaged in the business of recruitment, staffing and employment of Schedule "A" professionals such as registered nurses and licensed physical therapists." The

² In response to the Director's RFE, the petitioner submitted an organizational chart listing 27 positions and an unknown number of healthcare professionals and field workers. The petitioner did not provide an explanation as to the difference between the organizational chart and the statement on the Form I-129 that it employs two people in the U.S. 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).

petitioner continues, "[a]s a leading provider of healthcare professionals all around the country, our organization adheres to its mission of placing highly qualified and ethical professionals to existing as well as potential client medical institution including the state of New York. To facilitate and maintain this significant objective, our company requires the employment of a Healthcare Recruiter."

With respect to the proffered position, the petitioner states that the position of healthcare recruiter requires a bachelor's degree in human resources, marketing, entrepreneurship, commerce or a related field. The petitioner states that the duties of the proffered position "include but are not limited to the following:"

- Source, identify and recruit not traditionally and especially through the use of available computer-initiated methods, licensed physical therapists, occupational therapists and speech therapists, among others for immediate assignments to our affiliated healthcare facilities within the [REDACTED] jurisdiction including utilizing the recruitment database to maintain and track relationships with high potential candidates for future opportunities;
- Implement and utilize cost-effective recruitment strategies to attract highly qualified and diverse candidates;
- Identify traditional and non-traditional recruitment sources;
- Manage the process of selection and placement of qualified candidates;
- Promote and ensure diverse applicants are in the process;
- Conduct or coordinate interview schedules with hiring managers and candidates;
- Provide a high-level of client service;
- Support managers to create job descriptions; [and]
- Extend offers and negotiate with applicants; ensure on-boarding process is complete including background checks, offer letters, new hire paperwork, among others.

The petitioner submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the instant H-1B. The petitioner indicates that the proffered position corresponds to the occupational category "Human Resources, Labor Relations, and Training Specialists, All Other"-SOC (ONET/OES Code) 13-1078, at a Level I (entry level) wage.

In response to the Director's RFE, the petitioner further elaborates upon the duties of the proffered position, as follows:

- Research, design, and implement strategies directed to recruiting helthcare [sic] professionals chiefly phycian [sic] therapists, occupational therapists and speech therapists for placement at our client facilities. Conduct recruitment efforts at target rich sources of professional therapists including school placement departments, PT Forum and advertising vacancies at professional and trade journals.
- Gather recruited therapists' documents pertinent to education accomplishment, state licenses, work history, criminal background and immigrations.

- Research and analyze data gathered in establishing fits or compatibility of available personnel to potential assignments using individual competencies, experience, educational background, character and distance from residence as some of the yardsticks for decision making;
- Coordinate and schedule recruited therapists for work assignment orientation and state or federal continuing professional education/training requirements.
- Visit client facilities from time to time, to interview personnel and conduct on-site observation to ascertain unit function, work performance and service standards are meeting both client and company expectations.
- Conduct screening interviews, administer tests, check references and backgrounds, evaluate applicants qualifications and arrange for preliminary training.

The petitioner further indicates that the proffered position requires a bachelor's degree and that the beneficiary will be their first healthcare recruiter. In response to the RFE, the petitioner also included, among other things, a printout of the section entitled "Human Resources Specialists or Labor Relations Specialists" from the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*.³

C. Analysis

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

We will now discuss the proffered position in relation to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1), which requires that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position.

USCIS recognizes the *Handbook* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses. The petitioner asserts in the LCA that the proffered position falls under the occupational category "Human Resources, Labor Relations, and Training Specialists, All Other."⁴

³ The petitioner included a printout from an undated version of the *Handbook* for the occupation "Human Resources Specialists or Labor Relations Specialists." The 2014-2015 version of the *Handbook* lists the corresponding occupation category as "Human Resources Specialist and Labor Relations Specialist." Upon review, we have determined that the education information submitted by the petitioner from the undated version of the *Handbook*, matches the same education information provided in the 2014-2015 version. Therefore, all of the references are to the 2014-2015 edition of the *Handbook*, which may be accessed at the Internet site <http://www.bls.gov/OCO/>. The excerpts of the *Handbook* regarding the duties and requirements of the referenced occupational category are hereby incorporated into the record of proceeding.

⁴ We withdraw the Director's finding that the duties described for the proffered position are comparable to the duties of an administrative services manager.

We reviewed the section of the *Handbook* covering "Human Resources Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists," including the section entitled "How to Become a Human Resources Specialist or Labor Relations Specialist," which states the following:

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

Education

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

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

Work Experience in a Related Occupation

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

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

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2014-15 ed., Human Resources Specialists and Labor Relations Specialists, available on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/human-resources-specialists-and-labor-relations-specialists.htm> (last viewed June 9, 2015).

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

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

Level I (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the employer's methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work 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

The *Handbook* does not support the assertion that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into this occupation. Instead, it states there are a wide range of degrees that are acceptable for positions in this occupation, including a general-purpose degree such as business. To demonstrate that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge as required by section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position. Although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. See *Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 147.⁶ Further, the *Handbook* also indicates that the level of education and experience required for a human resources specialist or labor relations specialist vary by position and employer, and candidates with a high school diploma may also qualify for some interviewing and recruiting positions. The *Handbook* does not indicate that normally the minimum

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.

Thus, in accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, this wage rate indicates that the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation and carries expectations that the beneficiary perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he would be closely supervised; that his work would be closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he would receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. DOL guidance indicates that a Level I designation should be considered for positions in which the employee will serve as a research fellow, worker in training, or an intern.

⁶ Specifically, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit explained in *Royal Siam* that:

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

requirement for entry into the occupation is at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Further, the petitioner's requirement of a bachelor's degree in human resources, marketing, entrepreneurship, commerce or related field indicates that the duties of the proffered position can be performed by someone with a degree in a number of disparate fields. In other words, the petitioner did not identify how the different acceptable fields of study (human resources, marketing, entrepreneurship or commerce) are related to one another or how these fields make up a body of specialized knowledge that is directly related to the performance of the job duties of the proffered position.

In response to the Director's RFE and again on appeal, the petitioner submits information from DOL's [REDACTED]. The occupation profile for "Human Resources Specialist" for New York states the following:

Education and Training:

Occupation: Human Resources Specialists

Typical education needed for entry: Bachelor's degree

Typical work experience needed for a job in this occupation: None

Typical on-the-job training once you have a job in this occupation: None

While this indicates that a bachelor's degree is a typical requirement for entry, it does not indicate that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty is typically required. Again, the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) is one that requires a degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, that is directly related to the proffered position. As such, the information provided by [REDACTED] is not sufficient to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that the proffered position falls under an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, indicates that normally the minimum requirement for entry is at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. 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 independent, 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. Also, there are no submissions from the industry's professional association indicating that it has made a degree a minimum entry requirement.

The petitioner submitted copies of job advertisements in support of the assertion that the degree requirement is common to its 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 petition, the petitioner states that it is an employment and staffing firm with two employees, established in [REDACTED]. The petitioner did not provide its gross annual or net income. The petitioner designated its business operations under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 561310; however, this is not a valid code.⁷

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

We will briefly note that, without more, the job postings do not appear to be from organizations similar to the petitioner.⁸ When determining whether the petitioner and the advertising organization share the same general characteristics, such factors may include information regarding the nature or

⁷ According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is used to classify business establishments according to type of economic activity and each establishment is classified to an industry according to the primary business activity taking place there. See <http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/> (last visited June 9, 2015).

⁸ Moreover, 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.

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.

More specifically, the advertisements include a position with [REDACTED] company traded on the [REDACTED] and employs 5,100 nationwide. The petitioner also provided advertisements that do not provide sufficient information regarding the employers. The petitioner did not supplement the record of proceeding with additional information or state which aspects or traits it shares with the advertising organizations. Without further information, the advertisements appear to be for organizations that are not similar to the petitioner.

Further, the petitioner has not established that the advertisements are for parallel positions. For example, the position with [REDACTED] requires "2-4 years of specialized recruitment and/or staffing experience." As previously discussed, the petitioner designated the proffered position on the LCA through the wage level as a Level I (entry level) position relative to others within the occupation. The advertised positions appear to be for 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 are parallel to the proffered position.

In addition, some job postings do not indicate that a bachelor's degree in a directly related specific specialty is required. For example, [REDACTED] requires a bachelor's degree, but does not indicate a specific specialty. Similarly, [REDACTED] do not require a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty but indicate that a bachelor's degree in various fields such as Nursing, HR, Management, business, marketing or communication is sufficient. 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 such a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the specialty occupation claimed in the petition.

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.⁹ That is, as the evidence does not establish that similar organizations in the same industry

⁹ 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 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

routinely require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for parallel positions, not every deficit of every job posting has been addressed.

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).

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 submitted various documents, including evidence regarding its business operations such as incorporation documents and an organization chart. We reviewed the record in its entirety and find that the petitioner has not provided sufficient documentation to support a claim that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by an individual with a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

This is further evidenced by the LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of the instant petition. The LCA indicates a wage level at a Level I (entry) wage, which is the lowest of four assignable wage levels.¹⁰ Without further evidence, the evidence does not demonstrate that the proffered position is complex or unique as such a position falling under this occupational category 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.¹¹ For example, a Level IV (fully

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.

¹⁰ As previously mentioned, the wage-level of the proffered position indicates that (relative to other positions falling under this occupational category) the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation; that he will be expected to perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results.

¹¹ The issue here is that 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

competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."¹² The evidence of record does not establish 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.

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 believe are so complex and unique. In response to the RFE, the petitioner listed various courses completed by the beneficiary such as Human Resources Management, Personality Development, General Psychology and more. While a few related courses may be beneficial, or even required, in performing certain duties of the position, the evidence does 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 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. The record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as more complex or unique from other positions that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The petitioner claims that the beneficiary is well qualified for the position. 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 did not establish that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Therefore, 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

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.

¹² 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.

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* § 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.

The petitioner stated in the Form I-129 that it has two employees and that it was established in 2010 (approximately three years prior to filing of the H-1B petition). In response to the RFE, the petitioner indicated that the beneficiary is the first person to fill the position as a healthcare recruiter. Therefore, the petitioner has not established a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, and 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.

Upon review of the record of the proceeding, we note that the petitioner has not provided probative evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. In the instant case, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position. That is, the proposed duties have not been described with sufficient specificity to establish that they are more specialized and complex than positions that are not usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

We further incorporate our earlier discussion and analysis regarding the duties of the proffered position, and the designation of the proffered position in the LCA as a Level I position (the lowest of four assignable wage-levels) relative to others within the occupational category. Without more, the position is one not likely distinguishable by relatively specialized and complex duties. That is, without further evidence, the petitioner has not demonstrated that its proffered position is one with specialized and complex duties as such a position falling under this occupational category would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level III (experienced) or Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a substantially higher prevailing wage.¹³

The petitioner has submitted insufficient evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. We, therefore, conclude that the petitioner did not satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, the petitioner has 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.

III. BENEFICIARY QUALIFICATIONS

We do not need to examine the issue of the beneficiary's qualifications, because the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. In other words, the beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation.

¹³ As previously discussed, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems" and requires a significantly higher wage.

As discussed in this decision, the petitioner did not submit sufficient evidence regarding the proffered position to determine whether it will require a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Absent this determination that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is required to perform the duties of the proffered position, it also cannot be determined whether the beneficiary possesses that degree or its equivalent. Therefore, we need not and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications further, except to note that, in any event, the petitioner did not submit an evaluation of his foreign degree or sufficient evidence to establish that his degree is the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. As such, since evidence was not presented that the beneficiary has at least a U.S. bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, the petition could not be approved even if eligibility for the benefit sought had been otherwise established.

IV. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

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.