


D2

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

identifying data deleted
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

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



File: WAC-01-290-57043 Office: California Service Center

Date: MAR 31 2003

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)

PUBLIC COPY

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 a California company that currently operates one restaurant in San Diego. It has 45 employees and a projected gross annual income of \$702,268.50. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a quality assurance director 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 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), the term "specialty occupation" is defined 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 petitioner had not demonstrated that the proffered position requires a baccalaureate degree. On appeal, counsel states, in part, that the Department of Labor (DOL) in its *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)* determined that the position of quality assurance director is a specialty occupation. Counsel further states that the record contains an opinion from a credentials evaluation service in support of his claim that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

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:

[F]ormulate and establish organizational policies and operating procedures for our restaurants. In this capacity, she would develop, implement, and coordinate product assurance programs to assure the highest levels of quality, cleanliness, service, and efficiency at all of our restaurants in the U.S. She would also work with other managers to monitor and update quality control procedures.

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 or a related field. Counsel asserts that the proffered position is a specialty occupation because it has been assigned a specific SVP rating in the DOL's *DOT* (4th Ed., Rev. 1991). However, the *DOT* is not considered 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*.

The petitioner's assertion that the beneficiary will assure the highest levels of quality, cleanliness, service, and efficiency at all of its restaurants in the United States is noted. The record indicates, however, that the petitioner operates only one restaurant. As such, the proffered position appears to be primarily that of a food service manager. A review of the DOL's *Handbook*, 2002-2003 edition, at pages 56-57, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty for employment as a food service manager. Most food service management companies and national or regional restaurant chains recruit management trainees from 2 and 4-year college hospitality management programs. In addition, some restaurant and food service manager positions, particularly self-service and fast food, are filled by promoting experienced food and beverage preparation and service workers. 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, for the offered position. Third, although the record contains information from two restaurants' websites, none of the information is persuasive evidence of a degree requirement being common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. The website information submitted does not contain specifics regarding the duties of the position advertised or the prospective employers' job requirements, and, more importantly, it does not indicate that a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty is a minimum requirement for entry into the occupation. 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 record contains an opinion from a credentials evaluation service stating that the usual requirement for positions such as the proffered position is a baccalaureate degree in business

administration. The opinion contains an expanded description of the duties the petitioner anticipates the beneficiary would perform as a "quality assurance director." While this description is noted for the record, it is not indicative of the proffered position at the time of filing. As such, it provides little support for the instant petition and is insufficient evidence of an industry standard.

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.