



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

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

DJ

FILE: SRC 04 174 50378 Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER Date: MAR 22 2006

IN RE: Petitioner:
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:

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert P. Wiemann".

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 fine dining restaurant and bar that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an executive chef. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to § 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. On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

Section 214(i)(l) of 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 an executive chef. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's June 3, 2004 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the beneficiary would perform

duties that entail performing the administrative, supervisory, culinary, and training responsibilities of the entire restaurant. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree and extensive experience in the culinary industry.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because the job is not so complex as to require a bachelor's degree. 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 cites to an unpublished AAO decision to state that an executive chef working in a fine dining facility qualifies as a specialty occupation. Counsel states further that the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)* assigns the position an SVP rating of 8, which according to counsel, qualifies it as a specialty occupation. Counsel also states that the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) provides an official definition of executive chefs as professionals, and that the beneficiary has been approved previously for an H-1B executive chef position. Counsel states further that the record contains job advertisements demonstrating that the degree requirement is industry wide.

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. 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 counsel that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. No evidence in the *Handbook*, 2006-2007 edition, indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for an executive chef job.

The record of proceeding does not contain a copy of the visa petition that was previously approved on behalf of the beneficiary. It must be emphasized that each petition filing is a separate proceeding with a separate record. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.8(d). In making a determination of statutory eligibility, CIS is limited to the information contained in that individual record of proceeding. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(ii). As the director properly reviewed the record before her, it was impracticable for the director to provide the petitioner with an explanation as to why the prior approval was erroneous, as counsel suggests.

CIS disagrees with counsel that the policy enacted by the FLSA is relevant to the proffered position. The FLSA requires employers to pay covered employees who are otherwise not exempt at least the federal minimum wage and overtime pay for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek. The FLSA, however, does not deal with

membership in a specialty occupation, and its policies are not binding on CIS. Therefore, CIS is not bound to find that the position of an executive chef is a specialty occupation simply because the FLSA “accepts the National Restaurant Association’s position on Executive Chef as exempt ‘professionals’.”

Counsel’s reference to and assertions about the relevance of information from the *DOT* are not persuasive. The *DOT*’s SVP rating 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. An SVP rating is meant to indicate only the total number of years of vocational preparation required for a particular position. The classification 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.

The record contains a letter from a community college instructor, who states, in part, that the beneficiary’s bachelor’s degree in communications “would be necessary, because of the complexity and supervisory responsibility required by many major food service corporations.” The writer does not state that the proffered position requires a bachelor’s degree in a culinary-related field. Further, the *Handbook* is a compilation of results of nationwide industry questionnaires, surveys and personal interviews by the DOL, and indicates that there is no specific degree requirement for entry into the field. The AAO may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinion statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, the AAO is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988).

Regarding parallel positions in the petitioner’s industry, the petitioner submitted Internet job postings for executive chefs. The majority of the advertisements do not stipulate a degree in a specific specialty. Further, the advertisers include two hotels and a major university; the petitioner, however, has not demonstrated that the proposed duties of the proffered position are as complex as the duties described for these positions. Thus, the advertisements have no relevance.

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, therefore, has 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. 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.

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 record does not contain independent evidence that the evaluator of the beneficiary's credentials 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, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(I). Thus, the record does not establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the services of a specialty occupation. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

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.