



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

[Handwritten signature]

[Redacted]

FILE: WAC 02 287 52948 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 27 2004

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:
[Redacted]

PUBLIC COPY
identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office 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.

Mari Johnson
Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is an elderly care residential facility that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a business operations analyst. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to 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).

The director denied the petition because the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and other documentation.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184 (i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) 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)(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.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a business operations analyst. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's September 10, 2002 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the

beneficiary would perform duties that entail: analyzing, proposing, and implementing improvements in operations in order to facilitate the petitioner's expansion plans; setting up software programs; upgrading medical, food, and supply services; streamlining insurance handling; setting up a quality control program; designing and implementing personnel procedures; and assisting in the development and implementation of a marketing plan. (Note below, however, that the duties described in the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence (RFE) were different). In its job announcement, the petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in industrial psychology.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation. Citing to the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, 2002-2003 edition, the director noted that the minimum requirement for entry into two positions similar to the proffered position, that of a general manager and a human resources specialist, was not a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. The director found further that the petitioner failed to establish any of the criteria found at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

On appeal, counsel states that the proffered position is most correctly classified as an operations research analyst or a management analyst, positions which, according to counsel, are specialty occupations. Upon review of the record, however, the petitioner has established none of the four criteria outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Therefore, the proffered position is not a specialty occupation.

The AAO notes that the job description provided in response to the RFE portrays quite a different position from that described in the initial filing. The director's characterization of the position as administrative and managerial is logical, given that the petitioner, in its response to the RFE, wrote that 50 percent of the beneficiary's time would be spent assisting the administrator, 20 percent on automating record keeping systems, 15 percent on preparing budgets and licensing applications for any new facilities, and 15 percent on accounting duties. The petitioner also wrote that the beneficiary would be expected to "fill in as needed" in the areas of administration and direct care. On appeal, counsel states that the beneficiary would perform all the listed administrative tasks solely in order to become familiar with the duties and procedures involved. This is not what was indicated in the response to the RFE, in which the petitioner's breakdown of the job duties was succinct. Thus, the AAO finds that the record describes two very different positions, and counsel's explanation is unconvincing.

The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8). When responding to a request for evidence, a petitioner cannot offer a new position to the beneficiary, or materially change a position's title or its associated job responsibilities. The petitioner must establish that the position offered to the beneficiary when the petition was filed is a specialty occupation. *See Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248, 249 (Reg. Comm. 1978). If significant changes are made to the initial request for approval, the petitioner must file a new petition rather than seek approval of a petition that is not supported by the facts in the record.

For the purposes of this analysis, the job duties will be examined as they were initially described in the petitioner's letter in support of the petition. The AAO turns first to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2): a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations; or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree.

Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D.Min. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The AAO does not concur with counsel that the proffered position is that of an operations research analyst. According to the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, operations research analysts help determine better ways to coordinate the management of large organizations by applying analytical methods from mathematics, science, and engineering. This does not describe the scope or method of the beneficiary's job duties.

The duties of the proffered position resemble those of a management analyst, as that position is described in the *Handbook*. According to the *Handbook*, "many fields of study provide a suitable educational background for this occupation because of the wide range of areas addressed by management analysts. These include most academic programs in business and management, such as accounting and marketing, as well as economics, computer and information sciences, and engineering." Thus, while a baccalaureate or higher degree may be required for a management analyst position, no information in the *Handbook* indicates that the degree must be in a specific specialty.

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the petitioner submitted several job postings for positions which appear to differ from the instant position. The record contains no evidence to show that the employers issuing those postings are similar to the petitioner or that the advertised positions are parallel to the instant position. Thus, the advertisements have little relevance. The record also does not include any evidence from professional associations regarding an industry standard, or documentation to support the complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. The petitioner has, thus, not established the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) or (2).

The AAO now turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) – the employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position. Since this is a new position, there is no information on the record to document this criterion.

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(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. To the extent that they are depicted in the record, the duties do not appear so specialized and complex as to require the highly specialized knowledge associated with a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. Therefore, the evidence does not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition. 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. The petition is denied.