

Identifying data deleted to prevent clearly identifiable invasion of personal privacy

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: WAC 02 163 53038 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: Oct 1 2007

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.

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 a dental clinic, and seeks to employ the beneficiary as an oral prophylaxist. 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 position was not a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief stating that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

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

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of 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 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 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.

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 are 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 counsel's brief. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

By correspondence dated January 10, 2003, the petitioner responded to the director's request for evidence. In the response, the petitioner detailed the duties to be performed by the beneficiary. The duties listed, however, were not simply a more detailed version of the duties originally submitted, but listed new duties to be performed by the beneficiary that were not mentioned or referenced in the initial submission of duties. For example, the petitioner's response states that the beneficiary will: conduct standard lab experiments; prepare teeth and sections of teeth for use in a variety of experiments; record, analyze, summarize, graph, and tabulate experimental data; and conduct randomized clinical trials to test the effectiveness of fluoride varnish in preventive early childhood cases. 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 that was offered to the beneficiary at the time the I-129 petition was filed is a specialty occupation. See *Matter of Michelin Tire*, 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. The duties submitted in response to the director's request for evidence do materially change the associated job responsibilities from those originally submitted in support of the I-129 petition. Accordingly, the new duties will not be considered by the AAO.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as an oral prophylaxist. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes the Form I-129 petition with attachment. According to the evidence the beneficiary would: examine patients in a dental/orthodontic setting for indications of disease of gum or teeth, swelling and inflammation, decay of teeth and gums, and other visual indicators of oral hygiene problems; perform prophylaxis including cleaning of teeth and gums, removal and treatment of decay and deposits, and arrest of all oral ailments; chart and record the oral conditions of patients; and assist the dentist/orthodontist in mapping a treatment plan of corrective action for the patient. The petitioner requires a bachelor's degree in dentistry for entry into the proffered position.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the offered position, or that a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. 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 U.S. Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* for information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The duties of the proffered position are essentially those noted for dental hygienists. The *Handbook* notes that while dental hygienists must be licensed by the State in which they practice, a minimum of an associate degree or certificate in dental hygiene is required for practice in a private dental office. The petitioner has, therefore, failed to establish the first criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The petitioner has not established 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 submitted three opinion letters from other dental clinics. Each opinion states that the proffered position requires a minimum of a Bachelor of Science degree in dentistry. Three opinions, however, are insufficient in scope to establish an industry standard for the educational requirements of the proffered position. Furthermore, none of the opinions qualify the authors as experts in the field or otherwise provide the basis of the opinion. The opinions are, therefore, of little evidentiary value.

The petitioner does not state that it normally requires a degree in a specific specialty for the proffered position, and offers no evidence in this regard. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

The duties of the proffered position are routine for dental hygienists in the industry. They are not so complex or unique that they can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty. Nor are they so specialized or complex that knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) and (4).

The petitioner also asserts that previous agency decisions have classified similar positions as specialty occupations. This reference will not sustain the petitioner's burden of establishing H-1B qualification in the petition now before the AAO. This record of proceeding does not contain the entire record of proceedings in the petitions referred to by counsel. Accordingly, no comparison of the positions can be made. Each nonimmigrant petition is a separate proceeding with a separate record. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(d). In making a determination of statutory eligibility, the AAO is limited to the information contained in the record of proceeding. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(ii). It warrants noting that Congress intended this visa classification for aliens that are to be employed in an occupation that requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Congress specifically stated that such an occupation would require, as a *minimum* qualification, a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty. CIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such professions. These occupations all require a baccalaureate degree in the specialty occupation as a minimum for entry into the occupation and fairly represent the types of professions that Congress contemplated when it created that visa category. In the present matter, the petitioner has offered the beneficiary a position as an oral prophylaxist. For the reasons discussed above, the proffered position does not require attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty as a

minimum for entry into the occupation, and approval of a petition for another beneficiary based on identical facts would constitute material error, gross error, and a violation of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2 paragraph (h).

The petitioner has failed to establish that the offered position meets any of the criteria listed at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). 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.