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

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

FILE: EAC 02 109 53715 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: APR 26 2004

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

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]

PUBLIC COPY

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

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 is a pawnshop and loan business that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst/level one. 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. The director also denied the request for a change of status because the beneficiary was not properly maintaining a valid non-immigrant status. On appeal, the petitioner submits a brief.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 248.3(g), there is no provision for an appeal from the denial of a change of status. Therefore, this issue will not be discussed further.

Section 214(i)(l) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184 (i)(l), 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 programmer analyst/level one. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; "Employment Contract" signed by the petitioner and beneficiary on November 19, 2001; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: "Avaluates [sic], modifies existing system; design and implementation of application to structure and access database, using direct object oriented tools such as C/C++, VB, Java and utilizing tools and relational database management system based on SQL Server, Access and FoxPro, development of a web front end, support code maintenance with C/C++, HTML, XML, and provides database development for SQL Server, Designes [sic], Codes, Documents and maintains components of a large, cleverly architected [sic] distributed serverside application system. Manipulates configuration data through SQL and VBA programming." Although not explicitly stated, it appears that the petitioner requires a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent in a computer-related field for the proffered position.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the petitioner had not demonstrated that the actual, daily duties would require the skills of a computer analyst. 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, in part, that the beneficiary would spend his entire time designing and developing computer programs and presenting hundreds of items to be sold by the petitioner. Counsel further states that the proposed duties are so complex that a baccalaureate degree in computer science is required.

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 (DOL) *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. The AAO does not concur with counsel that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. A review of the Computer Programmers job description in the *Handbook*, 2004-2005 edition, finds that, while there are many training paths available for computer programmers, the associate degree is an increasingly attractive entry-level credential for prospective computer programmers. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a computer programmer job, as described by the petitioner.

The record does not include any evidence regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry or from professional associations regarding an industry standard. Nor does it include any documentation to support the complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. 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. As counsel does not address this issue on appeal, it will not be discussed further.

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(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.

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO does not find that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation because the credentials evaluation is based upon the beneficiary's education and work experience. A credentials evaluation service may not evaluate an alien's work experience or training; it can only evaluate educational credentials. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(*3*). Thus, the evaluation carries no weight in these proceedings. *Matter of Sea, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 817 (Comm. 1988). However, as the AAO is dismissing the appeal on another ground, it will not examine this issue further.

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.