



preventing data related to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service



D2

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

File: WAC-00-115-52170

Office: California Service Center

Date: 04 FEB 2002

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)

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 computer consulting and food service business with two employees and two subcontractors and a gross annual income of \$225,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a catering manager/executive chef 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 and additional documentation.

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 professional in nature. On appeal, counsel argues in part that the proffered position requires the services of an individual with a bachelor's degree in either food service management or culinary arts.

Counsel's statement 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:

Plans menus taking into account probable number of guests, marketing conditions, and popularity of various dishes. Coordinates catering events. Estimates consumption and purchases foodstuffs and kitchen supplies. Reviews menus, analyzes recipes, determines food, labor, and overhead costs, and assigns prices to menu items. Directs foodstuffs apportionment policy to control costs. Observes methods of foodstuff preparation and cooking, sizes of portions, and garnishing of dishes

to ensure dishes are prepared in prescribed manner. Tastes foodstuffs. Devises special menus and develops recipes. Hires and discharges employees. Familiarizes newly hired Chefs with practices of kitchen. Maintains time and payroll records. Establishes and enforces nutrition and sanitation standards. Supervises and coordinates activities of chefs and other workers engaged in preparing and cooking foodstuffs. Gives instructions to chefs in fine points of cooking.

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 position of catering manager/executive chef would normally require a bachelor's degree in culinary arts or a related field. The proffered position appears to combine the duties of a chef with those of a food services manager. A review of the Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 2000-2001 edition, at pages 336-337 finds no requirement of a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area for employment as a chef. Some chefs learn their trade through on-the-job training or through apprenticeships. Others hold certificates, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees from senior colleges and universities, junior and community colleges, or culinary institutes. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Additionally, the Handbook at page 78 does not state that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area is required for employment as a food service manager. Executive chefs need extensive experience working as chefs. Some restaurant and food service managers are promoted from the ranks of restaurant workers. Others hold baccalaureate and associate (two-year) degrees in restaurant management and other fields of study. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Counsel on appeal cites the portion of the Handbook at page 78 which states that, while several avenues of entering the profession are available, a bachelor's degree in hotel and restaurant or hospitality management, food service management or culinary arts provide a particularly strong preparation for a career in the field. However, the Handbook further states at page 78:

Most food service management companies and national or regional restaurant chains recruit management trainees from 2- and 4-year college hospitality management programs...

For those not interested in pursuing a 4-year degree, more than 800 community and junior colleges, technical institutes, and other institutions offer programs in these fields leading to an associate degree or other formal certification.

Clearly, while a baccalaureate degree in restaurant and food service management is desirable for employment in the field, other types of training such as that received at community colleges and technical institutes are also acceptable for entry into the field of restaurant management.

Counsel further 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 Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), 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 Department of Labor 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.

While counsel asserts on appeal that the beneficiary will supervise other chefs who are required to have a degree in food service or culinary arts or the equivalent, no independent evidence has been submitted to corroborate this assertion.

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 culinary arts, for the offered position.

Counsel argues on appeal that a bachelor's degree in food service management or culinary arts is a standard requirement for the food service industry in parallel positions and submits three letters from hotel managers in support of his argument. Each hotel manager states that his establishment requires a bachelor's degree in hotel restaurant management for its executive chef. However, three letters are not sufficient to establish that the degree requirement is common to the food service industry in parallel positions.

It is noted that counsel also submits on appeal an extensive list of educational institutions in the United States which offer a bachelor's degree in food service management or culinary arts. However, as stated above, this list does not serve to establish that the degree requirement is common to the food service industry in parallel positions.

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.