




DA

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

106. Copying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: SRC-97-155-51833 Office: Texas Service Center

Date: AUG - 6 2002

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)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a private individual who seeks to employ the beneficiary as a pre-school tutor/teacher in her home for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(ii) defines the term "specialty occupation" as:

an occupation which 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 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.

The director denied the petition because the duties described by the petitioner did not appear to be so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree. On appeal, counsel submits excerpts from several publications to demonstrate that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

Counsel's evidence on appeal is not persuasive. The Service does not use a title, by itself, when determining whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation. The specific duties of the offered position combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations are factors that the Service considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

Provide tutoring services for young child; exercise professional training and experience to prepare child for private school education.

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.

The petitioner has not met any of the above requirements to classify the offered position as a specialty occupation.

The Service does not agree with counsel's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in education or a related field. Counsel asserts that the Department of Labor has determined that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. However, a reference in the Department of Labor's (DOL) Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), Fourth Edition, 1977, standing alone, is not enough to establish that an occupation is a specialty occupation. The DOT classification system and its categorization of an occupation as "professional and kindred" are not directly related to membership in a profession or specialty occupation as defined in immigration law. In the DOT listing of occupations, any given subject area within the professions contains nonprofessional work, as well as work within the professions.

The latest edition of the DOT does not give information about the educational and other requirements for the different occupations. This type of information is currently furnished by the DOL in the various editions of the Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook). The latter publication is given considerable weight (certainly much more than the DOT) in determining whether an occupation is within the professions. This is because it provides specific and detailed information regarding the educational and other requirements for occupations.

A review of the DOL's Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment as a preschool teacher. It states, in part, that:

Most States have established minimum educational or training requirements. Training requirements are most stringent for directors, less so for teachers, and minimal for childcare workers and teacher assistants. In many centers, directors must have a college degree, often

with experience in childcare and specific training in childhood development. Teachers must have a high school diploma and, in many cases, a combination of college education and experience. Assistants and childcare workers usually need a high school diploma, but it is not always a requirement. Some employers prefer to hire workers who have received credentials from a nationally recognized childcare organization, including the Council for Professional Recognition.

Many States also mandate other types of training for staff members, such as health and first aid, fire safety, and child abuse detection and prevention. In nearly all States, licensing regulations require criminal record checks for all childcare staff.

Although counsel argues that the State of Georgia requires that an individual have a bachelor's degree "in order to teach a child other than their own," the excerpt from the Georgia law indicates that such requirement is for private schools and home study programs. The petitioner, however, does not appear to be either. Counsel submits affidavits from individuals who work in a "tutor-nanny" capacity. As such, it appears that the beneficiary would be working in such capacity as well. The record, however, contains no evidence that a "tutor-nanny" requires a bachelor's degree. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Second, the petitioner has not shown that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specialized area such as education, for the offered position. Third, although the record indicates the teachers at various preschools in the Atlanta area hold baccalaureate or higher degrees, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that other private individuals require the services of individuals in parallel positions. The affidavits from individuals with education-related degrees working in a "tutor-nanny" capacity are noted. Two employers' hiring practices, however, do not exemplify the industry standard. The record contains no evidence from a professional organization indicating that such position requires a baccalaureate degree in an education-related field. Finally, the petitioner did not demonstrate that the nature of the beneficiary's proposed duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered

position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.