



D2

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Some information related to
this case is exempted from
release of personal privacy

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



File: WAC-01-063-50960 Office: California Service Center Date: JUN - 4 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:



JUN 10 2002

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 dentist office with ten employees and a gross annual income of \$700,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a treatment plan coordinator 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 states, in part, that the director erroneously concluded that the position of health service manager is not a specialty occupation. Counsel further states that the proffered position requires at least a bachelor's degree in pre-dentistry or an equivalent.

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:

- (1) Liaison with Delta Dental Net representatives regarding quality control guidelines and quality assurance measures;
- (2) Advises dentists of Dental Net quality assurance guidelines, including changing care provision duties and acceptable procedures;

(3) Fields inquiries and complaints from Dental Net members regarding the nature and extent of covered procedures and billings;

(4) Explain to patients the treatment or procedure to be done; If there will be necessary Changes or additional procedures; Discuss the optional treatment plan and other alternative methods.

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.

First, the Service does not agree with counsel's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in pre-dentistry or a related field. The proffered position appears to be that of a medical assistant rather than a health services manager. In its Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook), 2002-2003 edition, the Department of Labor (DOL) describes the job of a health services manager as follows:

The structure and financing of healthcare is changing rapidly. Future medical and health services managers must be prepared to deal with evolving integrated healthcare delivery systems, technological innovations, an increasingly complex regulatory environment, restructuring of work, and an increased focus on preventive care . . . Increasingly, medical and health services managers will work in organizations in which they must optimize efficiency of a variety of

interrelated services, for example, those ranging from inpatient care to outpatient follow-up care.

In smaller facilities, top administrators handle more of the details of daily operations. For example, many nursing home administrators manage personnel, finance, facility operations, and admissions, and have a larger role in resident care.

The record reflects that the petitioner, which is a dentist office, employs ten persons and has a gross annual income of \$700,000. The proposed duties of the medical coordinator are not those of health service manager, as described above. For example, there is no evidence that the position offered includes complex health service managerial duties such as managing personnel, finance, and facility operations.

The duties that the petitioner endeavors to have the beneficiary perform are primarily those of a medical assistant. In contrast to the description of a health services manager, in its Handbook, the DOL describes the position of a medical assistant as follows:

The duties of medical assistants vary from office to office, depending on the office location, size, and specialty. In small practices, medical assistants usually are "generalists," handling both administrative and clinical duties and reporting directly to an office manager, physician, or other health practitioner.

The types of duties the petitioner ascribes to the beneficiary fall within the scope of a medical assistant position rather than a health services manager position. For example, the petitioner states that the beneficiary will "[e]xplain to patients the treatment or procedure to be done" and "[d]iscuss the optional treatment plan and other alternative methods." Such duties are not duties normally associated with a medical services manager. 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 pre-dentistry, for the offered position. Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that businesses similar to the petitioner in their type of operations, number of employees, and amount of gross annual income, require the services of individuals 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. According to the DOL in its Handbook, there is no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment as a medical assistant. Medical assisting programs are offered in vocational-technical high schools, postsecondary vocational schools, community and junior colleges, and colleges and universities. In addition, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as important as a specific formal academic background. 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.