



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

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

D2



FILE: EAC 06 139 53869 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 14 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, Chief  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The director of the service center 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 wholesaler and manufacturer of ladies' accessories and novelties that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a marketing manager. The petitioner, therefore, 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.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) counsel'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 reaching its decision.

The issue before the AAO is whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the job it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

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:

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.

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) consistently interprets the term "degree" in the above criteria to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, CIS does not simply rely on a position's title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, are factors to be considered. CIS must examine the ultimate employment of the alien, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). The critical element is not the title of the position nor an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation, as required by the Act.

The petitioner seeks the beneficiary's services as a marketing manager. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the petitioner's April 10, 2006 letter in support of the petition and counsel's June 14, 2006 response to the director's request for evidence. As stated by the petitioner, the proposed duties are as follows:

Work with people at top levels of various business units; plan, schedule, conduct, direct, and evaluate all event and product sales for assigned territory. Assist customers with all aspects of project management. Analyze and evaluate sales trends and recommend changes to improve performance; and assist in the development and implementation of marketing programs. Identify customer needs; design promotions; and launch, implement, and administer programs. Conduct or assist in conducting portions of market research activities to identify targeted populations; identify the appropriate message for communication of promotional information to identified populations. Write copy describing product offerings; coordinate all production deliverables; schedule and execute all production payments; assist with maintaining production budgets; and plan and coordinate all print production projects.

The director found that the proposed marketing manager duties do not require a bachelor's degree. Citing the Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)*, the director noted that the minimum requirement for entry into the position was not a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. The director also found that the expert opinions were not corroborated by evidence that the writers have the authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university that has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience. The director concluded 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, in part, that the proffered position is a specialty occupation and that the beneficiary's bachelor's degree in hospitality management qualifies him for the specialty occupation. Counsel also states that the *Handbook* is clear in stating that for marketing manager positions, employers prefer either a bachelor or master's degree in marketing or an equivalent thereof. Counsel also cites the *O\*Net* to state that a marketing manager job is a job zone 4 position, which requires work experience plus a bachelor's degree or higher. Counsel submits letters from authorized university/college representatives as evidence that the writers of the previously submitted expert opinions have the authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university that has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience.

Preliminarily, counsel's interpretation of the *O\*Net* is not persuasive that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. The *O\*Net* does not indicate that a particular occupation requires the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation. The *O\*Net* provides 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 SVP rating does not describe how those years are to be divided among training, formal education, and experience, nor specifies the particular type of degree, if any, that a position would require.

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 *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. Minn. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. The AAO does not concur with the petitioner that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2006-07 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty is required for a marketing manager position. A wide range of educational backgrounds is suitable for entry into marketing manager jobs, but many employers prefer individuals with related experience and a broad liberal arts background. In this case, the beneficiary holds a U.S. bachelor's degree in hospitality management. Moreover, although information on the petition reflects that the petitioner was established in 1990, has 235 employees and a gross annual income of \$125 million, the record contains no evidence in support of the petitioner's claims, such as federal income tax returns and quarterly wage reports. There is no documentation about the marketing department, its employees, or the nature of the marketing to be performed for the company. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). Accordingly, the petitioner has not established the proffered position as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(iii)(A)(1).

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry, the record contains opinions from an associate dean for international programs at Portland State University and a professor at Mercy College in Dobbs Ferry, New York. Both writers assert that positions such as the proffered position require a related bachelor's degree. The record does not indicate that the writers have adequate knowledge of this matter. The opinions do not include a discussion of the proposed duties and/or the actual work that the beneficiary would perform within the context of this particular petitioner's business. The writers do not demonstrate knowledge of the petitioner's particular business operations. They do not relate any personal observations of those operations or of the work that the beneficiary would perform. Their opinions do not relate their conclusions to specific, concrete aspects of this petitioner's business operation to demonstrate a sound factual basis for their conclusions about the educational requirements for the particular position at issue. 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). As the opinions of the writers are not based on a factual foundation, the AAO does not find them probative in this matter.

The record does not include sufficient evidence from firms, individuals, or professional associations regarding an industry standard. In the alternative, the petitioner may show that the proffered position is so complex or unique that only an individual with a degree can perform the work associated with the position. In the instant petition, the petitioner has not submitted sufficient documentation to establish that the duties of the proffered position involve duties that are complex or unique; rather the petitioner has provided a general description of the occupation without identifying any complex or unique tasks pertinent to the petitioner's business that would elevate the position to one that requires the knowledge associated with a bachelor's degree in a specific discipline. The petitioner has failed to establish the proffered position as a specialty occupation under either prong of the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(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. As counsel does not address this issue on appeal, it will not be discussed further. The evidence of record does not establish 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.

The petitioner has not demonstrated that the duties are 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. The AAO here incorporates its discussion about the lack of concrete evidence about the petitioning entity. Due to the deficiencies discussed herein, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the proposed duties entail the specialization and complexity required by this criterion. Absent a meaningful description of the duties of the proffered position as the duties relate to the petitioner's business and substantiated by documentary evidence of the petitioner's business operations, the petitioner has not distinguished the proffered position based on the specialization and complexity of its duties from the routine duties of a marketing manager, an occupation that does not require knowledge usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree 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.

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.