

PUBLIC COPY

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



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**



D2

FILE: SRC 05 200 51507 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 12 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:



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, Texas 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 exports automobiles to customers in Europe and the Middle East and seeks to employ the beneficiary as a sales 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 on two independent grounds, namely, that the petitioner had failed to establish (1) that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation, and (2) that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner contends that the director erred in denying the petition, and that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation and that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of 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 additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The first issue in this matter is whether the petitioner has established position as 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 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) 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 proposed position.

The petitioner’s September 22, 2005 response to the director’s request for evidence states that the beneficiary would interact with its customers in Europe and would provide better services to existing and new customers in Europe. The petitioner’s April 20, 2005 letter of support did not list any duties and stated that the position was that of a full time sales manager.

In determining whether a proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation, CIS looks beyond the title of the position and determines, from a review of the duties of the position and any supporting evidence, whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. The AAO routinely consults the Department of Labor’s *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (the *Handbook*) for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations.

The *Handbook*’s discussion of the duties of advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales managers states the following:

Sales managers direct the firm’s sales program. They assign sales territories, set goals, and establish training programs for sales representatives (See the *Handbook* statement on sales representatives, wholesale and manufacturing). Sales managers advise the sales representatives on ways to improve their sales performance. In large, multiproduct firms, they oversee regional and local sales managers and their staffs. Sales managers maintain contact with dealers and distributors. They analyze sales statistics gathered by their staffs to determine sales potential and inventory requirements and to monitor customers’ preferences. Such information is vital in the development of products and the maximization of profits.

The petitioner did not include a list of duties for the proposed position and therefore the AAO is unable to determine whether the position is similar to those of sales managers as outlined by the *Handbook*. The AAO now turns to the *Handbook's* discussion of the qualifications necessary for entry into the field. The *Handbook* states the following with regard to the educational qualifications required for sales managers:

A wide range of educational backgrounds is suitable for entry into advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales managerial jobs, but many employers prefer those with experience in related occupations plus a broad liberal arts background. A bachelor's degree in sociology, psychology, literature, journalism, or philosophy, among other subjects, is acceptable. However, requirements vary, depending upon the particular job.

For marketing, sales, and promotions management positions, some employers prefer a bachelor's or master's degree in business administration with an emphasis on marketing. Courses in business law, economics, accounting, finance, mathematics, and statistics are advantageous. . . .

Most advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales management positions are filled by promoting experienced staff or related professional personnel. For example, many managers are former sales representatives, purchasing agents, buyers, or product, advertising, promotions, or public relations specialists. In small firms, where the number of positions is limited, advancement to a management position usually comes slowly. In large firms, promotion may occur more quickly.

Thus, the proposed position does not qualify for classification as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which requires a showing that a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the type of position being proffered. The *Handbook* indicates that most sales manager positions are filled on the basis of experience. Moreover, the fact that some employers “prefer” a degree or that individuals possessing degrees “should have the best job opportunities” does not rise to this criterion’s standard of employers normally requiring at least a bachelor’s degree or its equivalent in a specific specialty. As such, sales managers do not qualify as specialty occupations under the first criterion.

The *Handbook* also notes that a bachelor’s degree in a wide range of educational backgrounds is suitable for entry into sales managerial positions, however, when a range of degrees, e.g., the liberal arts, or a degree of generalized title without further specification, e.g., business administration, can perform a job, the position does not qualify as a specialty occupation. See *Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm. 1988). To prove that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of specialized knowledge as required by Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specialized field of study. Again, CIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position.

For all of these reasons, the proposed position does not qualify for classification as a specialty occupation under the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1), that a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the position.

Nor does the proposed position qualify as a specialty occupation under either prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). The first prong of this regulation requires a showing that a specific degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations.

In its response to the director's request for additional evidence, the petitioner did not submit any evidence that it is the industry standard among similar organizations to require a baccalaureate degree for parallel positions. In his appeal brief, counsel acknowledged that one reason for the director's denial was that the petitioner did not establish that a baccalaureate degree is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. However, counsel did not submit any evidence to establish the existence of such an industry standard. To meet the burden of proof imposed by the regulatory language, the petitioner must establish that its degree requirement exists in parallel positions among organizations similar to the petitioner. The petitioner has not submitted documentation to support such an industry standard.

Accordingly, the proposed position does not qualify as a specialty occupation under the first prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The second prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) requires the petitioner to establish that the duties of the proposed position are so complex or unique that only an individual with a degree can perform them. The nature of the duties of the proposed position, as set forth in the petition, does not support such a finding, as they are too vague. In his response to the request for evidence, counsel states that the job duties are so "unique and complex which can be performed only by [REDACTED] being a citizen of France." However, the record contains no documentation to support a finding that the proposed position is more complex or unique than sales manager positions at other, similar organizations. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Moreover, requiring the successful applicant to be a citizen of France is not evidence that the position requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge.

Therefore, the petitioner has not established that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation under either prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

Nor does the proposed position qualify as a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which requires a showing that the petitioner normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the proposed position. To determine a petitioner's ability to meet this criterion, the AAO normally reviews the petitioner's past employment practices, as well as the histories, including names and dates of employment, of those employees with degrees who previously held the position, and copies of those employees' diplomas.

However, this is a newly-created position, so eligibility under this criterion cannot be established.

The AAO notes that while a petitioner may believe that a proffered position requires a degree, that opinion cannot establish the position as a specialty occupation. Moreover, the critical element is not the title of the position or 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. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results. Were CIS limited solely to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed requirements, then any individual with a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the employer required the individual to have a baccalaureate or higher degree. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 384. Accordingly, the petitioner has failed to establish the referenced criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) based on its normal hiring practices.

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4), which requires a demonstration that 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 of the proposed position 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. There is no information in the record to support a finding that the proposed position is more specialized and complex than the general range of sales manager positions for which the *Handbook* indicates no requirement for the highly specialized knowledge associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty. Therefore, the evidence does not establish that the proposed position is a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

The petitioner has failed to establish that the position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation under any of the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

As noted *supra*, the director also denied the petition on the basis that the beneficiary does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, an alien must meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (2) Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (3) Hold an unrestricted state license, registration or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or

- (4) Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

In making its determination as to whether the beneficiary qualifies to perform the duties of a specialty occupation, the AAO turns to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), as described above. The beneficiary did not earn a degree from a United States institution of higher education, so he does not qualify under the first criterion.

Nor does the beneficiary qualify under the second criterion, which requires a demonstration that the beneficiary's foreign degree has been determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university. Although the initial filing stated that the beneficiary earned a bachelor's degree in accounting from the Academy of Versailles, France, the evaluation, submitted in response to the director's request for additional evidence, found the degree equivalent to a U.S. high school diploma from a vocational/technical high school with a specialization in Accounting. Accordingly, the AAO agrees with the director that the evidence in this matter is insufficient to show the beneficiary's foreign academic education is equivalent to a bachelor's degree in a specific discipline.

The record does not demonstrate, nor has the petitioner contended that the beneficiary holds an unrestricted state license, registration or certification to practice the specialty occupation; therefore, he does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation under the third criterion.

The fourth criterion, set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4), requires a showing that the beneficiary's education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience is equivalent to the completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and that the beneficiary also has recognition of that expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

Thus, it is the fourth criterion under which the petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary's eligibility to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), equating a beneficiary's credentials to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree is determined by one or more of the following:

- (1) An evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience;

- (2) The results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI);
- (3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials;
- (4) Evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional association or society for the specialty that is known to grant certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty;
- (5) A determination by the Service that the equivalent of the degree required by the specialty occupation has been acquired through a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to the specialty and that the alien has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation as a result of such training and experience.

The beneficiary does not qualify under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1), as the evaluation submitted by the petitioner did not state that [REDACTED], president of Foreign Credential Evaluations, Inc., has the authority to grant college-level credit for experience in marketing management at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on the beneficiary's work experience.

No evidence has been submitted to establish, nor has counsel contended, that the beneficiary satisfies 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(2), which requires that the beneficiary submit the results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI).

Nor does the beneficiary satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(3). As was the case under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(2), the beneficiary is unqualified under this criterion because the beneficiary holds the equivalent of a high school diploma and not a bachelor's degree.

No evidence has been submitted to establish, nor has counsel contended, that the beneficiary satisfies 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(4), which requires that the beneficiary submit evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional association or society for the specialty that is known to grant certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty.

The AAO next turns to the fifth criterion. When CIS determines an alien's qualifications pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5), three years of specialized training and/or work experience must be demonstrated for each year of college-level training the alien lacks. It must be clearly demonstrated that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while

working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty evidenced by at least one type of documentation such as:

- (i) Recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation by at least two recognized authorities in the same specialty occupation¹;
- (ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in the specialty occupation;
- (iii) Published material by or about the alien in professional publications, trade journals, books, or major newspapers;
- (iv) Licensure or registration to practice the specialty occupation in a foreign country; or
- (v) Achievements which a recognized authority has determined to be significant contributions to the field of the specialty occupation.

The AAO notes that the petitioner has submitted an evaluation of the beneficiary's education and work experience from [REDACTED] dated September 21, 2005. [REDACTED] states that the beneficiary's Certificate of Professional Proficiency: Accountant is the equivalent of a U.S. high school diploma from a vocational/technical high school with a specialization in Accounting. [REDACTED] concludes that the beneficiary's secondary school education plus sixteen years and seven months of post-secondary professional experience in Marketing Management are equivalent to the degree, Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing Management, for employment purposes, from an accredited education institute in the United States. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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).

The only information in the record regarding the beneficiary's previous work history are the employment letters provided by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Only the [REDACTED] letter dated October 7, 1996 provides a job description. The letter states that the beneficiary was responsible for:

¹ *Recognized authority* means a person or organization with expertise in a particular field, special skills or knowledge in that field, and the expertise to render the type of opinion requested. A recognized authority's opinion must state: (1) the writer's qualifications as an expert; (2) the writer's experience giving such opinions, citing specific instances where past opinions have been accepted as authoritative and by whom; (3) how the conclusions were reached; and (4) the basis for the conclusions supported by copies or citations of any research material used. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

- Management of 11 sales persons, in charge of the hiring and the good operation of the team, and in charge of licensing.
- In charge of management and operation of budgets for sales and marketing, and relating to customers for car products.
- Management of 1056 customers:
 - 146 major customers, sales of 160,000 Euro[s] each of them
 - 910 customers to be developed
- Analysis of request and of sales in the auto customers in view of permanent improvement of our catalogue and consequently to maintain our leadership in this branch.
- Prospecting of new customers in the auto line to grow our [s]ales and our notoriety in the auto field.
- Scout for and find new products relating to cars.

However, this letter does not establish that this work experience included the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Moreover, the previous employer has not provided evidence that this experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates with degrees in the specialty, or that the beneficiary has recognition of expertise in the field.

As such, the beneficiary does not qualify under any of the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(1)(2)(3)(4), or (5), and therefore by extension does not qualify under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4).

Thus, the beneficiary does not qualify to perform the duties of a specialty occupation.

The petitioner has not established that the proposed position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation, nor has the petitioner established that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO will 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.