



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 13068613

Date: JUNE 14, 2021

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Advanced Degree, Exceptional Ability, National Interest Waiver)

The Petitioner, a teacher, seeks second preference immigrant classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, as well as a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement attached to this EB-2 classification. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(2), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).

The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the Petitioner qualified for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but that he had not established that a waiver of the required job offer, and thus of the labor certification, would be in the national interest.

On appeal, the Petitioner submits additional documentation and a brief asserting that he is eligible for a national interest waiver.

In these 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. Upon *de novo* review, we will dismiss the appeal.

I. LAW

To establish eligibility for a national interest waiver, a petitioner must first demonstrate qualification for the underlying EB-2 visa classification, as either an advanced degree professional or an individual of exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business. Because this classification requires that the individual's services be sought by a U.S. employer, a separate showing is required to establish that a waiver of the job offer requirement is in the national interest.

Section 203(b) of the Act sets out this sequential framework:

- (2) Aliens who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or aliens of exceptional ability. –

(A) In general. – Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

(B) Waiver of job offer –

(i) National interest waiver. . . . [T]he Attorney General may, when the Attorney General deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirements of subparagraph (A) that an alien’s services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

While neither the statute nor the pertinent regulations define the term “national interest,” we set forth a framework for adjudicating national interest waiver petitions in the precedent decision *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. 884 (AAO 2016).¹ *Dhanasar* states that after a petitioner has established eligibility for EB-2 classification, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion², grant a national interest waiver if the petitioner demonstrates: (1) that the foreign national’s proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance; (2) that the foreign national is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor; and (3) that, on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.

The first prong, substantial merit and national importance, focuses on the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake. The endeavor’s merit may be demonstrated in a range of areas such as business, entrepreneurialism, science, technology, culture, health, or education. In determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, we consider its potential prospective impact.

The second prong shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the foreign national. To determine whether he or she is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor, we consider factors including, but not limited to: the individual’s education, skills, knowledge and record of success in related or similar efforts; a model or plan for future activities; any progress towards achieving the proposed endeavor; and the interest of potential customers, users, investors, or other relevant entities or individuals.

The third prong requires the petitioner to demonstrate that, on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification. In performing this analysis, USCIS may evaluate factors such as: whether, in light of the nature of the foreign national’s qualifications or the proposed endeavor, it would be impractical either for the foreign national to secure a job offer or for the petitioner to obtain a labor certification; whether, even assuming

¹ In announcing this new framework, we vacated our prior precedent decision, *Matter of New York State Department of Transportation*, 22 I&N Dec. 215 (Act. Assoc. Comm’r 1998) (*NYSDOT*).

² See also *Poursina v. USCIS*, No. 17-16579, 2019 WL 4051593 (Aug. 28, 2019) (finding USCIS’ decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

that other qualified U.S. workers are available, the United States would still benefit from the foreign national's contributions; and whether the national interest in the foreign national's contributions is sufficiently urgent to warrant forgoing the labor certification process. In each case, the factor(s) considered must, taken together, indicate that on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.³

II. ANALYSIS

The Director found that the Petitioner qualifies as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The remaining issue to be determined is whether the Petitioner has established that a waiver of the requirement of a job offer, and thus a labor certification, would be in the national interest. For the reasons discussed below, we agree with the Director that the Petitioner has not sufficiently demonstrated the national importance of his proposed endeavor under the first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework.

Regarding his claim of eligibility under *Dhanasar*'s first prong, the Petitioner indicated that his proposed endeavor in the United States "is to work as a public school teacher. The subjects he will teach include English, English as a second language (ESL), and philosophy." The Petitioner further stated: "Specifically, his endeavor is to teach English to English language learners (ELLs). . . . He intends to work at a public school in Oregon teaching, among other subjects, ESL, Spanish, English, and philosophy." In response to the Director's request for evidence (RFE), the Petitioner reiterated that his undertaking involves "working as a public school teacher instructing ELLs."

In a letter accompanying the appeal, the Petitioner asserts that his "goal is to teach language, incorporating literature, critical thinking, Philosophy 4 Children (P4C) and Philosophy to help improve conditions in the public sector, and particularly in the Latinx community in Oregon." He further explains: "As a teacher, I incorporate, as intrinsically essential to my endeavor, the methods of Individualizing, Differentiating and Personalizing each of my students learning needs and preferences. This integrated endeavor is what I would be bring[ing] [*sic*] to the USA for the benefit of high school students"

The record includes articles about teacher shortages in the United States and Oregon, the value of bilingual education, the costs and consequences associated with high school dropouts, a shortage of ELL teachers, Oregon's ranking as an attractive state for teachers, limited diversity in the teaching profession, teachers as engineers of learning and growth, demand for bilingual workers, and Oregon's need for ELL teachers. In addition, the Petitioner provided reports discussing ELL students and how they are being taught, the social and economic benefits of public education, ELL performance by state, academic performance and outcomes for ELLs, progress and challenges in raising high school graduation rates, and teacher shortage areas in the United States. He also offered information about the No Child Left Behind Act, the Bilingual Education Act, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), resources for teaching children philosophy, ESL teacher requirements, immigrant teachers as a solution for filling early childhood education positions in Oregon, teacher salaries, school closures attributable to the coronavirus pandemic, and [redacted] School District's dual language immersion program. The record therefore supports the Director's determination that the Petitioner's proposed work as a school teacher instructing ELL students has substantial merit.

³ See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 888-91, for elaboration on these three prongs.

In determining national importance, the relevant question is not the importance of the field or profession in which the individual will work; instead we focus on the “the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake.”⁴ See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. In *Dhanasar*, we further noted that “we look for broader implications” of the proposed endeavor and that “[a]n undertaking may have national importance for example, because it has national or even global implications within a particular field.” *Id.* We also stated that “[a]n endeavor that has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or has other substantial positive economic effects, particularly in an economically depressed area, for instance, may well be understood to have national importance.” *Id.* at 890.

In his appeal brief, the Petitioner points to his background, education, teaching experience, instructional methodology, and specialized training in his field. His appellate submission includes letters of support from academic colleagues and former students discussing his dissertation, professional development work, “Philosophy in Schools” accreditation, and personalized teaching approach. The Petitioner’s knowledge, skills, and experience in his field relate to the second prong of the *Dhanasar* framework, which “shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the foreign national.” *Id.* at 890.⁵ The issue here is whether the specific endeavor that he proposes to undertake has national importance under *Dhanasar*’s first prong.

The Petitioner asserts that the Director’s decision disregarded a letter from [redacted], a professor of sociology at the University of [redacted].⁶ [redacted] discussed a “Philosophy of Children” presentation by the Petitioner as part of his graduate studies at the University of [redacted]. She also noted that she evaluated his dissertation and “invited him numerous times to discuss issues connected to philosophical questions within education.” The Petitioner claims that [redacted]’s letter “demonstrates that the benefit of [the Petitioner’s] proposed research has broader implications, as [the Petitioner’s] methodology and research are disseminated to others in the field through presentations and seminars.”⁷ The information from [redacted] however, relates to the Petitioner’s past graduate work at the University of [redacted] (2014-2015) and does not explain how his proposed work as an Oregon public school teacher involves undertaking research and disseminating his findings to others in the field.

The Petitioner further argues that his proposed work as an Oregon public school teacher “would broadly enhance societal welfare and cultural enrichment,” but he does not offer specific examples of

⁴ The issue here is not the value of the U.S. education system or the impact of schooling on our country’s economy, but rather whether the Petitioner’s specific proposed endeavor as a teacher in the Oregon public school system rises to the level of national importance.

⁵ To establish that it would be in the national interest to waive the job offer requirement, a petitioner must go beyond showing his expertise in a particular field. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2) defines “exceptional ability” as “a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered” in a given area of endeavor. By statute, individuals of exceptional ability are generally subject to the job offer/labor certification requirement; they are not exempt by virtue of their exceptional ability. Therefore, whether a given petitioner seeks classification as an individual of exceptional ability, or as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, that individual cannot qualify for a waiver just by demonstrating a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered in his field of expertise. See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 886 n.3.

⁶ The Petitioner earned his “Master of Arts in English and Language in Education” from the University of [redacted] in 2015.

⁷ A second letter from [redacted] offered on appeal describes the Petitioner’s “Philosophy for Children” methodology and states that it had a “noticeable impact” on the academic staff at the University of [redacted]’s Institute of Education.

such impact. He also contends that his undertaking “has national implications for the United States, particularly in the field of education, where there already is such a shortage in interest.” In addition, the Petitioner asserts that his proposed “endeavor in aiding students in the public school system is incredibly nationally important, as seen through the severe shortage of teachers” in our country. Furthermore, he claims that “[h]is expertise will no doubt bring a progressive change in the exact way that the Department of Education is looking to implement for a better, localized school system under ESSA.”⁸

To evaluate whether the Petitioner’s endeavor satisfies the national importance requirement we look to evidence documenting the “potential prospective impact” of his work. In the present matter, the Petitioner’s evidence is insufficient to show that his proposed work has broader implications for his field, as opposed to being limited to the students at the school where he intends to teach. While the Petitioner offered articles indicating that both the United States and Oregon face a shortage of ELL teachers, this reported shortage does not render the work of an individual teacher nationally important under the *Dhanasar* framework.⁹ In general, the value of qualified English teachers to U.S. national educational initiatives is collective, and the Petitioner has not shown that his proposed work as a public school teacher stands to have wider implications in the fields of ESL, philosophy, or education.

The Petitioner’s documentation is not sufficient to demonstrate that his proposed endeavor is of national importance under the *Dhanasar* framework. While we acknowledge the merits of his work to create a positive learning environment and improve his students’ language proficiency and their preparation for future careers, the record does not demonstrate that the Petitioner’s proposed teaching activities offer benefits that extend beyond his particular school to impact the field of education more broadly.¹⁰ Accordingly, the Petitioner’s proposed work does not meet the first prong of the *Dhanasar* framework.

Because the documentation in the record does not establish the national importance of his proposed endeavor as required by the first prong of the *Dhanasar* precedent decision, the Petitioner has not demonstrated eligibility for a national interest waiver. Further analysis of his eligibility under the second and third prongs outlined in *Dhanasar*, therefore, would serve no meaningful purpose.

III. CONCLUSION

As the Petitioner has not met the requisite first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework, we conclude that he has not established he is eligible for or otherwise merits a national interest waiver as a matter of discretion. The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

⁸ The record, however, does not include any letters of support from the U.S. Department of Education or the Oregon Department of Education to corroborate the Petitioner’s claim.

⁹ We note that the U.S. Department of Labor addresses shortages of qualified workers through the labor certification process. Accordingly, a shortage alone does not demonstrate that waiving the requirement of a labor certification would benefit the United States.

¹⁰ Likewise, in *Dhanasar*, we determined that the petitioner’s teaching activities did not rise to the level of having national importance because they would not impact his field more broadly. *Id.* at 893.