

PUBLIC COPY

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clear, unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

DA

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



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

JUL 31 2003

File: SRC-02-054-50114 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date:

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)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



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 and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an educational childcare business with 22 employees and no disclosed gross annual income. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as "pre-kindergarten - kindergarten teacher" 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.

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. On appeal, counsel states, in part, as follows:

[T]he position of Lead Pre-Kindergarten Teacher at Primrose School of Hunter's Creek requires [the beneficiary] to have a baccalaureate degree in Early Childhood Education or Elementary Education. Further, [the petitioner] follows a stringent curriculum that is recognized by national organizations, such as the Commission on International and Trans-Regional Accreditation (CITA) and the North Central and Southern

Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA/SACS). Primrose School of Hunter's Creek has met the stringent educational and quality control standards required for corporate accreditation from both of these prestigious groups.

Under the Standards and Policies for the Accreditation of Early Childhood Schools and Centers, each teacher is required to have earned at least a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited or federal or state sanctioned institution, has a college major or a minimum of 24 semester hours in the assigned area of teaching and has 12 semester hours in professional education as a part of, or in addition to, the degree, or meets the legal qualifications of the state in which employed. . . .

Counsel's statement on appeal is not persuasive. 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:

Teach, monitor and supervise children during all classes for Pre-Kindergarten - Kindergarten students

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 early childhood education or elementary education. The proffered position is that of a "pre-kindergarten - kindergarten teacher" in an educational childcare business. A review of the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2002-2003 edition, at page 202, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment as a preschool teacher. It states, in part, as follows:

Licensing requirements for preschool teachers vary by State. Requirements for public school teachers are generally higher than those for private preschool teachers. Some States require a bachelor's degree in early childhood education and others require an associate degree, while others may require certification by a nationally recognized authority. The Child Development Associate (CDA) credential is the most common type of certification. It requires a mix of classroom training and experience working with children, along with an independent assessment of an individual's competence.

In this case, although counsel states that the petitioner's accredited status requires the beneficiary to have earned at least a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited or federal or state sanctioned institution, counsel has not submitted any documentation in support of this claim. Nor did a search of the websites of the various organizations cited by counsel reveal any specific information to corroborate his claim. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). 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, although the petitioner submitted a resume for one of its teachers occupying a similar position as the proffered one, in order to demonstrate that such a degree is required, the petitioner's reasoning is problematic when viewed in light of the

statutory definition of specialty occupation. The petitioner's creation of a position with a perfunctory bachelor's degree requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. As with employment agencies as petitioners, the Bureau must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position or an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a bachelor's degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act.¹ To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if the Bureau was limited to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed employment requirements, then any alien with a bachelor's degree could be brought into the United States to perform a menial, non-professional, or an otherwise non-specialty occupation, so long as the employer required all such employees to have bachelor's degrees. *See id.* at 388.

In this case, although the petitioner claimed to have hired only individuals with a bachelor's degree in early education or an equivalent thereof, for its preschool/kindergarten teachers, the position, nevertheless, does not meet the statutory definition of specialty occupation. The position, itself, does not require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Therefore, even though the petitioner has required a bachelor's degree in the past, the position still does not require a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty.

Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is common to the industry in parallel positions among organizations similar to the petitioner. 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

¹ The court in *Defensor v. Meissner* observed that the four criteria at 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) present certain ambiguities when compared to the statutory definition, and "might also be read as merely an additional requirement that a position must meet, in addition to the statutory and regulatory definition." *Supra* at 387.

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.