

DR

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

PUBLIC COPY

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536



JUL 21 2003

File: SRC-01-190-60312 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that 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 that 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 Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) 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 that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director. The director granted a subsequent motion to reconsider, affirmed her previous decision, and certified her decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The decision of the director will be affirmed.

The petitioner imports cut flowers and ornamental plants from Costa Rica for sale and distribution throughout the United States. It has two employees and an undisclosed gross annual income. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an office manager/president of product development for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On motion to reconsider, counsel had provided additional information in support of the motion.

The director affirmed her previous decision, reasoning that the petitioner had failed to establish that the position of an office manager is a specialty occupation.

Counsel has not submitted any additional information in response to the director's notice of certification.

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), provides in part for nonimmigrant classification to qualified aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines a "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and 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.

Pursuant to section 214(i)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(2), to qualify as an alien coming to perform services in a specialty occupation the beneficiary must hold full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation. In addition, the beneficiary must have completed the degree required for the occupation, or have experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not demonstrated that a baccalaureate degree is required for the proffered position.

The Bureau 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 Bureau considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

[The beneficiary] will be responsible for the directing and coordinating research and development activities for organizational products, services, and ideologies. She will also develop and implement methods and procedures for monitoring projects, such as preparation of records of expenditures and research findings, progress reports and staff conferences.

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 Bureau does not agree with counsel's assertion that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree

in business administration with a concentration in marketing, or a related field. The proffered position appears to combine the duties of an office and administrative support worker supervisor or manager, with those of a marketing manager. Counsel asserts that the proffered position is a specialty occupation because it has been assigned a specific SVP rating in the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)* (4th Ed., Rev. 1991). However, the AAO does not consider the *DOT* a persuasive source of information regarding whether a particular job 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.

The DOL has replaced the *DOT* with the *Occupational Information Network (O*Net)*. Both the *DOT* and *O*Net* provide only general information regarding the tasks and work activities associated with a particular occupation, as well as the education, training and experience required to perform the duties of that occupation. The DOL's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* provides a more comprehensive description of the nature of a particular occupation and the education, training and experience normally required to enter into an occupation and advance within that occupation. For this reason, the Bureau is not persuaded by a claim that the proffered position is a specialty occupation simply because the DOL has assigned it a specific SVP rating in the *DOT*.

In its *Handbook*, 2002-2003 edition, at page 418, the DOL finds that most firms fill office and administrative support supervisory and managerial positions by promoting clerical or administrative support workers from within their organizations. Furthermore, at page 28 of its *Handbook*, the DOL finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment in marketing managerial jobs. A wide range of educational backgrounds is suitable, but many employers prefer those with experience in related occupations plus a broad liberal arts background. In addition, most marketing management positions are filled by promoting experienced staff or related professional or technical personnel. 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 specific specialty such as business administration with a concentration in marketing, for the offered position. Third, although the record contains a letter from an individual

employed in the nursery industry who asserts that positions similar to the proffered position require a baccalaureate degree in business administration with a concentration in marketing, the writer has not provided evidence in support of his assertions. Nor has he indicated the number or percentage of office managers of small establishments such as the petitioner's who hold such degrees. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). 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 director's order of June 13, 2002, denying this petition is affirmed.