

DZ

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass, Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



FILE: EAC 04 049 52642 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **AUG 31 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

PUBLIC COPY

**identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**

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 a healthcare services personnel provider that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a medical assistant. 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 and the beneficiary is not qualified to perform a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

The AAO will first address the director's conclusion that the position is not a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(1) of 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; (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 medical assistant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's December 2, 2003 letter of support; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to the letter of support, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: taking and recording vital signs and medical histories; preparing patients for examination; drawing blood; administering medications; scheduling appointment; maintaining medical records; and billing and coding for insurance purposes. According to the response to the director's request for evidence, the beneficiary's duties would entail: taking medical histories; examining and treating patients under the supervision of a physician; ordering and interpreting laboratory texts and x-rays; making preliminary diagnoses; treating minor injuries by suturing, splint and casting; and supervising technicians and assistants. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in science or a related field.

There is a significant change in duties between the initial petition and the response to the director's request for evidence. CIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. 103.2(b)(12). Any evidence that adds duties not described at the time of filing the petition will not be considered. Eligibility must be established at the time of filing; a visa petition may not be approved at a future date after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978).

A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to CIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm. 1998). Therefore, the duties listed in the initial petition will be those on which this matter will be adjudicated.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation. 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 meets all four of the regulatory criteria. Counsel submits an opinion from an associate professor of the University of Virginia School of Medicine stating that he believes the position itself and the industry standard require a bachelor's degree in medicine. Additionally, counsel states that the position is sufficiently specialized and complex to establish it as a specialty occupation. Finally, counsel states that the petitioner normally requires a degree for the position.

Upon review of the record, 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 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 Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (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. A review of the Medical Assistant job description in the *Handbook* confirms the accuracy of the director's assessment that the job duties submitted with the initial petition parallel the responsibilities of a Medical Assistant. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a medical assistant job.

The petitioner did not submit any information regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry. 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 submitted a letter from a medical school professor, which provided no substantive information regarding his belief that it is "general practice within the medical field" to require a bachelor's degree for the proffered position. Additionally, this information is in direct conflict with both the *Handbook* and numerous sources of information on the Internet, which indicate that one typically prepares for a position as a medical assistant through a vocational program, or through a program of study that results in less than a bachelor's degree. CIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, CIS is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988). In this case, the opinions are not in accord with either the information in the *Handbook* or that available through the Internet. 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. Counsel states that the petitioner has always hired medical assistants with at least a bachelor's degree in "medical science" and, as evidence, submits a copy of a job announcement the petitioner posted in its offices. This does not establish past hiring practices. In the request for evidence, the director requested "evidence of the educational attainment of each of your other medical assistants." The petitioner chose not to respond to this request. The petitioner has not met its burden of proof in this regard.

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 director also found that the beneficiary would not be qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position if the job had been determined to be a specialty occupation. The director acknowledged that the beneficiary possesses the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in biology and chemistry from a U.S. university. The AAO does not concur with the director that the beneficiary's degree is equivalent to a degree in biology and chemistry. The AAO notes that the transcript provided indicated that the beneficiary received a bachelor of arts (rather than science) degree in an unspecified concentration. He appears to have taken five chemistry classes, three zoology classes, one biology class, and four classes in other science-related topics. It is not clear that this coursework equates to a major in chemistry and biology, as it would be understood at a U.S. university. In addition, the individual who performed the evaluation for The Trustforte Corporation is now the attorney of record. This raises some question as to a conflict of interest. CIS uses an evaluation by a credentials evaluation organization of a person's foreign education as an advisory opinion only. Where an evaluation is not in accord with previous equivalencies or is in any way questionable, it may be discounted or given less weight. *Matter of Sea, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988).

Finally, on appeal, counsel now presents evidence that the beneficiary possesses a medical degree. The only evidence submitted to establish that the degree is equivalent to a U.S. degree is from a professor in the Department of Computer Information Systems at Medgar Evars College of the City University of New York. The evaluator states that he has authority to grant college-level credit in "Computer Science, and subdisciplines including Information Technology and Computer Engineering." There is no indication as to why this evaluator would be qualified to make an equivalency evaluation for a doctor of medicine. In addition, CIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12). The director requested evidence regarding the beneficiary's educational background. The purpose of a 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).

On December 19, 2003, the petitioner was put on notice of required evidence relating to the beneficiary's qualifications and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the visa petition was adjudicated. The regulation states that the petitioner shall submit additional evidence as the director, in his or her discretion, may deem necessary. The purpose of the request for evidence is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14).

Where, as here, a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, the AAO will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *see also Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, it should have submitted the documents in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* Under the circumstances, the AAO need not and does not consider the sufficiency of the evidence submitted on appeal.

EAC 04 049 52642

Page 6

The petitioner did not establish the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position.

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.