


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



U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



FILE: EAC 02 250 53408 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 28 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]

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
for 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 operates a restaurant and seeks to employ the beneficiary as an executive chef. 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 states that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

The issue to be discussed in this proceeding is whether the position offered to the beneficiary qualifies as a specialty occupation.

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 the classification of qualified nonimmigrant aliens who are coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation.

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.

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

[A]n occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in field 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.

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

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary’s services as an executive chef. Evidence of the beneficiary’s duties includes the I-129 petition with attachment, and the petitioner’s response to the director’s request for evidence. According to the I-129 petition, the beneficiary would: be responsible for the operation of the kitchen; direct and supervise a kitchen staff of four chefs and one dishwasher; train chefs and other kitchen workers to ensure an efficient and profitable food service; plan and create menus and utilize food surpluses and leftovers by taking into account the probable number of guests, popularity of various dishes and marketing conditions; estimate food consumption; requisition foodstuffs and kitchen supplies; determine food, labor, and overhead costs; assign price to menu items; coordinate workers’ assignments; hire and discharge employees; devise special dishes and develop recipes; check the content of deliveries; evaluate the quality of meats and poultry, fish, fruits, vegetables, and baked goods; oversee all food preparation and cooking; examine the quality of portion sizes to ensure that dishes are prepared and garnished correctly in a timely manner; monitor the actions of employees and customers to insure that health, safety standards, and regulations are obeyed; and investigate and resolve customer complaints. The petitioner further explained the duties of the offered position in its response to the director’s request for evidence. The petitioner requires a bachelor’s degree or its equivalent for entry into the offered position.

The director found that the offered position did not qualify as a specialty occupation and failed to meet any of the criteria of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). On appeal, counsel states that the proffered position meets the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that the offered position meets the requirements of the above cited regulatory criteria. Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the Department of Labor’s *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether an industry 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/Baker Corp. v. Slattery*, 764 F. Supp. 872, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1991).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are essentially those noted for chefs. In the *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2004-05 edition, the Department of Labor describes, in part, the duties of an Executive Chef as follows:

Executive chefs and *head cooks* coordinate the work of the kitchen staff and direct the preparation of meals. They determine serving sizes, plan menus, order food supplies, and oversee kitchen operations to ensure uniform quality and presentation of meals. The terms chef and cook often are used interchangeably, but generally reflect the different types of chefs and the organizational structure of the kitchen staff. For example, an *executive chef* is in charge of all food service operations and also may supervise the many kitchens of a hotel, restaurant group, or corporate dining operation. A *chef de cuisine* reports to an executive chef and is responsible for the daily operations of a single kitchen. A *sous chef*, or sub chef, is the second-in-command and runs the kitchen in the absence of the chef. Chefs tend to be more highly skilled and better trained than cooks. Many chefs earn fame both for themselves and for their kitchens because of the quality and distinctive nature of the food they serve.

The duties associated with the proffered position are similar to those listed above. The *Handbook* further notes that to achieve the level of skill required of an executive chef, many years of training and experience are necessary. Though many chefs learn their craft through on the job training, formal training is becoming increasingly popular. Employers usually prefer training given by trade schools, vocational centers, colleges, professional associations, or trade unions. Postsecondary courses range from a few months to 4 years or more. It is, therefore, apparent that a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent is not the minimum requirement for entry into the proffered position. The petitioner has failed to establish the first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The petitioner has also failed to establish that a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). In support of this assertion, the petitioner submits a position evaluation from Klaus Tenbergen, Professor of Culinary Arts at Kendall College. Professor Tenbergen states that the position of executive chef is a specialty occupation requiring a bachelor's level education in culinary arts, or a related field. The professor further opines that it is a standard industry practice for restaurants which meet, or seek, a luxury standard to employ executive chefs who possess a bachelor's level education in the culinary arts, or a related field. The AAO does not agree. As noted in the *Handbook*, executive chefs are routinely hired in the industry with less than a baccalaureate level education. Many learn their profession on the job, without university level training. In further support of this assertion, the beneficiary supplied five job advertisements. Five advertisements is not sufficient to establish an industry standard. Furthermore, the advertisements submitted support the findings of the *Handbook* in that one of the advertisements indicated that a degree was preferred, not required. Another listed a degree requirement, but does not state what level of degree is required.

The petitioner has not proven that the duties of the offered position are so complex or unique that they can only be performed by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty, or that the nature of the position's duties is so specialized or complex that knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) and (4). The duties detailed are routine and generally performed by executive chefs in the industry. They are not unique, specialized, or unusually complex.

Finally, the employer asserts that it normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position offered. In support of that assertion the petitioner submitted an experiential evaluation for the current executive chef, the petitioner's owner, indicating that he holds the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in culinary arts. Assuming arguendo that this is the case, the proffered position still does not qualify as a specialty occupation. The performance of the duties of the position must still involve the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 2000). This position does not.

As noted above, the duties of the position are routinely performed in the industry by individuals with less than a baccalaureate level education.

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 and the appeal shall accordingly be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.