U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Public Engagement
Washington, DC 20529-2000

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

February 24, 2011

Questions & Answers

USCIS Quarterly National Stakeholder Engagement

Intake and Document Production

Question: Fee Waivers

a) Please provide statistics on fee waiver applications, approvals, and denials for the last six months, broken down by types of immigration applications.

Response:

FEE WAIVER REPORT

NOTE: * = form is not eligible for fee waiver

Basis: Inability to Pay				
Form Type	Received	Approved	Denied	Approval Rate
I-90	4,520	2,959	1,561	65%
I-102 *	135	0	135	0%
I-129 *	54	0	54	0%
I-130 *	465	0	465	0%
I-131	329	132	197	40%
I-192	6,638	6,253	3	94%
I-193	193	193	0	100%
I-212	7	2	3	29%
I-290B	534	365	173	68%
I-290C *	8	7	1	88%
I-360 *	17	2	15	12%
I-485	15,755	13,698	2,057	87%
I-539	301	224	77	74%
I-601	237	174	63	73%
I-612 *	1	0	1	0%
I-687 *	10	7	3	70%
I-751	378	193	185	51%
I-765	16,655	14,857	1,797	89%
I-817	6	3	3	50%
I-821 TPS	1,724	1,333	391	77%
I-824 *	74	0	74	0%
N-400	18,028	14,767	3,261	82%
N-565	651	383	275	59%
N-600/K	696	550	142	79%
Motions	192	189	3	98%
EOIR	252	135	116	54%
TOTAL	67,860	56,426	11,055	83%

b) When considering whether a fee waiver applicant's income is at or below 150% of the poverty level, is USCIS looking at gross income or net income?

Response: We use the adjusted gross income from Federal tax documents such as W-2. If there is not a W-2 then we look at whatever paper is available to substantiate adjusted gross income e.g. a signed statement indicating what their gross income is.

c) Please provide an update on USCIS' efforts to train staff adjudicating fee waivers and how USCIS is monitoring fee waiver decisions to ensure staff is adhering to the new policy.

Response: The Office of Intake and Document Production held five WebEx-based training sessions in November. The number of staff in attendance was as follows:

25 – Office of Intake and Document Production
142 – Field Operations Directorate
48 – Refugee, Asylum and International Operations Directorate
44 – Service Center Operations Directorate
259 – TOTAL

The majority of fee waiver requests are adjudicated by staff within the Office of Intake and Document Production. Supervisors monitor fee waiver decisions by randomly reviewing their team's work. In addition, supervisors periodically reinforce that fee waivers must be adjudicated in accordance with established policies/guidelines and ensure that each analyst working Fee Waiver Requests keeps a paper copy of the Fee Wavier Standard Operating Procedures at their desks.

d) In the past, the fee waiver denial letter explained the reasons for the denial. Will denial letters under the new policy/form still explain the reasons for the denial?

Response: Yes, information on the reason the fee waiver is being denied will still be explained on the I-797 if the applications and request was processed through a USCIS Lockbox facility. Non-lockbox cases will also provide the reason(s) for a fee waiver denial on a G-1054.

e) If we feel that a fee waiver denial was made in error, how can we bring a case to USCIS's attention? Should we still use the lockbox e-mail? If so, can you provide that e-mail again?

Response: Yes, Lockboxsupport@dhs.gov

Question: Mailing Instructions

We've noticed that OPT applications sent to the new Lock Box address with Texas Service Center are being sent back to truncated return addresses. Apparently the Lock Box staff will not include any "care of" information and will just omit it. Also, apparently they are omitting the additional four digits after the zip code (even though there seem to be fields for those.) Can USCIS verify this information and/or explain the process.

Response: There is no C/O field on the I-765 form. We are aware of the issue concerning the fact that c/o addresses, when provided in the address field on Forms I-765, are not being captured as part of the address. If USCIS were to ask the lockbox to put the c/o in the address field then we would run the risk of truncating the return address as the address data field is limited to a certain number of characters.

Please provide examples of truncated return addresses.

Form I-765 is being revised to include a c/o data field so that this information can be captured in the future.

Lockbox does not capture the additional four digits after the zip code.

Question: Secure Mail Initiative (SMI)

Under USCIS's SMI what can I do if my card has not been received after being notified of my application's approval?

Response: Under SMI, USCIS mails all proof of benefit cards (PRC's & EAD's) with Delivery Confirmation tracking through the US Postal Service (USPS). Each card receives a USPS tracking number. Customers who have not received their card in what they consider a timely manner can call the USCIS Customer Service line (at **1-800-375-5283**) to ask the delivery status of their card. The USCIS Customer Service Representative will provide the customer with a USPS tracking number for their card AND tell them the current USPS delivery status, including the date of delivery, time, and location, if delivery was already completed. If delivery has not yet been completed, customers are informed that they can go to USPS website at http://www.usps.com to track the delivery status themselves by entering their delivery confirmation number into the Track & Confirm field, or may call USPS Customer Service tracking line at 1-800-222-1811 to obtain the latest USPS delivery status information. NOTE: SMI tracks card delivery by a customer's receipt number, the customer's address on file, mailing date and time, USPS Delivery Confirmation number, which shows USPS delivery status (route and date of any delivery). ***Confirmation is for delivery at that address.*** No signature is required for completion of the delivery. If a customer has not received his/her card although USPS tracking says it was delivered, s/he may call the USPS Customer Service line and request a delivery inquiry.

Customer Service Directorate

Question: Case Status Online

The current USCIS computer system does not allow I-829 status to be checked online. Can this be fixed?

Response: Due to system constraints, there is no capability for allowing I-829 status to be checked online. If an I-829 is outside normal processing time, a note may be sent to the EB5 mailbox USCIS.ImmigrantInvestorProgram@dhs.gov

Question: National Customer Service Center Responses

O & P applicants oftentimes have questions about case status or the RFEs they receive and contact the National Customer Service Center. Individuals indicate that they often get the "runaround" or are told a response is pending and they should receive something soon, but never do. This then prompts members to escalate their questions or issues to their Congressional representatives, ambassadors, or the national association. This raises several questions:

- Is this a training issue with the Tier 1 operators? If not, what does USCIS think is the issue?

- Is there additional information callers should be providing operators to get a more informative response?
- It appears that the RFEs are sometimes unclear and that this may be because of the types of RFEs issued for O & P applications. Is there anything that USCIS can do to make the RFEs clearer?

Response: Information given to the customer at the National Call Service Center is scripted at the TIER 1 level. At the TIER 2 level a customer obtains more detailed information regarding the status of their case. The TIER 2 officers have access to USCIS systems.

- This is not a training issue with Tier 1 because Tier 1 does not have access to USCIS system. Tier 2 Tier 2 provides information that is indicated in the USCIS systems. Detail information of the RFE is not indicated in the USCIS system. The system only indicates that a RFE was given to the applicant. The call center only option is a SRMT to the Field or Service Center for additional information.
- The caller can provide detail information on the letter received. This will ensure the call center directs the SRMT to the correct office.
- Bothe O and P RFE templates are currently under review as part of the RFE project. The P templates should be available for public comment this month.

International Operations

Question: Cuban Family Reunification Program

Now that dates have retrogressed – how is the Cuban Family Reunification Parole Program being treated? What will happen to the program? Will it continue as explained previously or will it halt? If so, for how long?

Response: Visa retrogression impacts the Cuban Family Reunification Parole Program (CFRP) to the extent that it impacts who is immediately eligible to receive a visa and who must wait. As explained in the Federal Register announcement that established the CFRP on November 21, 2007, the CFRP is available to Cuban nationals who reside in Cuba and are beneficiaries of approved Forms I-130, Petition for Alien Relative, "for which an immigrant visa is not yet immediately available." The CFRP was designed to allow Cuban nationals in oversubscribed family-sponsored visa categories, to apply immediately for parole to the United States, to expedite the family reunification and deter those waiting long period for their visa numbers to become available to attempt to come to the U.S. through irregular migration.

In October, the Department of State (DOS) determined that the F2A visa category had become current and F2A visa applicants were immediately eligible for visas. Therefore, the DOS and USCIS announced that, since visas for F2A beneficiaries were immediately available, these beneficiaries were not longer eligible for parole under the CFRP. To ease the transition for those already in the queue awaiting parole, DOS and USCIS provided a grace period to continue processing parole for those in the F2A category through the end of the calendar year and announced that those in the F2A category would be interviewed for immigrant visas and would not be paroled under the CFRP starting January 1, 2011. In early December, DOS determined that the priority date for visas in the F2A category changed from being current to having retrogressed to January 2008 due to an increase in F2A visa applications world-wide. Due to this finding, DOS announced that these F2A eligible individuals would revert back to CFRP cases in order to allow immediate processing, using the original CFRP interview schedule. Cuban Form I-130 beneficiaries for whom visas are not immediately available will remain eligible to seek parole under CFRP unless their visa category becomes current.

Field Operations Directorate

Question: Visa Bulletin

Can individuals whose priority date came up during the November/December visa bulletin, but are not current on the January/February 2011 bulletin, apply to begin the LPR process by showing they were previously eligible? Of particular interest is the "all other nations" category.

> **Response:** INA 245(a) and 8 CFR 245.1(a) and (g) require that a visa number be immediately available upon filing Form I-485. Therefore, applicants who were previously eligible to begin the LPR process because a visa was available, but did not apply before the visa category regressed are not eligible to file until a visa again becomes available. The current Department of State Bureau of Consular Affairs Visa Bulletin is consulted to determine whether a visa is immediately available.

Question: Temporary Evidence/Stamps for I-829s

Various USCIS Field Offices appear to be deciding issues differently. For example, some USCIS Field Offices refuse to issue temporary evidence (stamp in passport) of permanent resident status on the ground that the current stamp is valid for another month, or will not issue temporary stamp until the applicant and family members have attended a Masters Hearing after an I-829 denial. Can USCIS issue a standard procedure on issuing temporary stamps while an I-829 is pending and also after the I-829 has been denied but before a final order of removal has been entered?

> **Response:** USCIS has standard guidance regarding the issuance of temporary stamps while the I-829 is pending. This guidance can be found in chapter 25.2 of the Adjudicators' Field Manual. Officers are advised that no extension of status can be given to an alien who has not timely filed a Form I-829, unless USCIS accepts a late petition based upon the alien's showing of good cause in accordance with 8 CFR 216.6(a)(5). Upon receipt of a properly filed Form I-829, USCIS is authorized by 8 CFR 216.6(a)(1) to extend automatically a conditional resident's status, if necessary, until such time as USCIS has adjudicated the petition. The I-797 receipt notice for the I-829 automatically gives a one year extension of status.
>
> 8 CFR 216.6(d)(2) states in regard to a denied I-829 that "the alien's lawful permanent resident status and that of his or her spouse and any children shall be terminated as of the date of the director's written decision." However, if the I-829 has been denied and an NTA has been issued, but no final order of removal has been entered, then USCIS must collect the expired conditional permanent resident card and follow established procedures for providing a temporary extension of the alien's conditional resident status upon request at a local USCIS Field Office. If the temporary extension is granted, then the aliens will be authorized to work and may travel outside the United States.

Question: V-2 Applications

There is no logically correct box to check on the I-539 for V-2 applicants who have reached 21 years of age and who should benefit from the USCIS policy adopted on May 16, 2005, following the Akhtar v. Burzynski decision. Applicants whose prior V-2's have expired are not in good status at the time of submitting the new I-539. Therefore, selecting a box marked "an extension of stay in my current status" makes no sense.

While USCIS provided both a Memo and a Press Release explaining the substantive right to re-join V-2 status, neither source provided specific guidance on the procedure, beyond stating that applicants should

apply on form I-539. USCIS did not amend form I-539 to cover the new situation of previous V-2 holders whose status had expired, nor did it provide instructions on how to fill out form I-539.

Applicants whose V-2 status has expired are given inadequate choices on the I-539 form. Logically, a person over 21 years of age seeking to re-join V-2 status would check "A change of status," listing "V-2" as the new status requested. It would not be logical to check box "a", seeking "an extension of stay in my current status" because that would indicate an election to stay in the United States with no legal status.

Is it appropriate policy for USCIS to deny applicants a V-2 Visa simply because USCIS itself did not clarify the application procedure?

> **Response:** The appropriate choice to mark would be the "extension" box. A V-2 applicant age 21 or older is ineligible for an initial grant of V status, so the change of status box would be inappropriate; however, we recognize that the form instructions on the Form I-539, Supplement A instruct applicants to check box "b" on the I-539 (change of status). We will work to have the form instructions updated to reflect the changes created by the *Akhtar v. Burzynski* decision.
>
> An applicant for extension of V-2 status whose V-2 status expired prior to *Akhtar v. Burzynski*, 384 F. 3d 1193 (9th Cir. 2004) and who failed to file timely, or whose application was denied solely because he was 21 years or older was granted a one time extension based on the *Akhtar* decision, if he was otherwise eligible. *See* Section 37.4 of Adjudicator's Field Manual and USCIS Press Release, May 16, 2005: USCIS Announces New Policy Regarding V Status Extensions.

Question: Asylee Derivatives

We understand that if an asylee derivative files an I-485 and is not eligible to adjust at the time due to change in the principal's situation, but rather needs to file nunc pro tunc, that USCIS will keep the fee and deny the I-485 application. However, what if the need to file a nunc pro tunc arises after the I-485 and while it is pending (for example the principal asylee naturalizes)? In that case, will USCIS allow the derivative to process nunc pro tunc while keeping the I-485 open, and not have to pay another fee? This would be extremely helpful to our clients.

> **Response:** If the derivative asylee no longer meets the definition of a spouse or child of a refugee, he or she is ineligible for adjustment of status under the provisions of INA § 209(b)(3). The individual would need to apply for and be granted asylum as a principal to become eligible for asylum-based adjustment. USCIS will not hold I-485 applications pending the adjudication of nunc pro tunc asylum applications; however, if the applicant is aware that he/she is going to become ineligible for adjustment, it is best to alert USCIS prior to becoming ineligible and we can work to expedite the I-485 application, if appropriate.

Question: EOIR and Adjustment of Status

The USCIS Office of Chief Counsel in San Francisco contacted and encouraged respondents with pending I-485s with EOIR to join motions to terminate in order for CIS to adjudicate the same I-485 without any additional filing fee. USCIS confirmed as recently as Nov. 4, 2010 that they will do so and will accept the original I-693s filed with EOIR. USCIS retracted this on Jan. 6, 2011 and announced that these cases will be on hold without a commitment that new filing fees won't have to be paid. In at least one of these cases, the I-765 based on the pending I-485 for an EAD renewal has been pending for over 90 days.

> **Response:** If the applicant initially files for adjustment of status before the Immigration Judge (IJ) and pays the fee through the Texas Service Center and the IJ terminates proceedings without

making a decision on the Form I-485 application, USCIS will honor this filing and will not require that the applicant refile or pay the filing fee again. Field Operations recognized that clarifying guidance was required on this issue. On January 25, 2011, an instruction was sent to the field and the NBC, indicating that these I-485s should be processed without requiring an additional fee. The Form I-693 will also remain valid as specified under current guidance as stated in AFM chapter 40.1(c). As indicated in the December 16, 2010, policy memorandum amending chapter 40.1(c), until January 12, 2012, a Form I-693 will still be valid, even after the one-year validity period that normally applies, if the Form I-693 was included with the initial filing of the I-485 and there is no Class A or Class B condition. This policy memorandum is available at www.uscis.gov.

Questions: Haiti

a) Because the humanitarian parole for 1 year expires soon, what will be the possibilities to enroll again? Will Haitians be able to renew their visa?

Response: An individual who has previously been granted humanitarian parole may request an extension or re-parole. USCIS reviews humanitarian parole requests on a case-by-case basis. We are not presently considering a blanket policy to authorize parole for all Haitians.

b) What is the latest on deferred action for Haitians?

Response: USCIS will review requests for deferred action on a case-by-case basis. Factors to be considered in evaluating a request for deferred action include (but are not limited to) the presence of sympathetic or compelling factors related to: the applicant's health, ability to travel, home country conditions, family ties and length of time in the U.S., history of employment and/or community service, military service, and overall priority for, as well as the likelihood of removal.

c) We have several cases that are pending for deferred action for Haitians. Is there a hold placed on these cases? If so, why is there a hold?

Response: USCIS strives to process deferred action requests quickly. Some offices have received a significant volume of requests, and given that some requests require additional review, many requests remain pending.

d) When will HQ issue guidance on how USCIS is processing these cases?

Response: Deferred action is a discretionary tool that USCIS can exercise to allow certain individuals to remain in the United States temporarily. We are reviewing all requests on a case-by-case basis and currently do not intend to issue formal guidance for deferred action.

Question: Selective Service

An increasing number of people appear to have genuinely not known that they needed to register for Selective Service. Could you consider making that heading more prominent on your Web site?

Response: Yes, we will add content on our website to include more information about the need to register for Selective Service.

Service Center Operations Directorate

Question: Request for Evidence (RFE) Project

It is our understanding that USCIS is reviewing RFE templates. Can the agency provide an update on where USCIS is in the process and when they expect to get to the other categories/classifications?

Response: USCIS is actively engaged in Phase One of the RFE project which includes the following categories:

- ***Q Nonimmigrants*** – International cultural exchange visitors

  The Q nonimmigrant RFE template went final and was posted for stakeholder viewing from December 10, 2010 to December 23, 2010.

- ***P Nonimmigrants*** – Artists, athletes, and entertainers

  The P nonimmigrant RFE template is currently being updated and USCIS anticipates having it ready for stakeholder review very soon.

- ***Nonimmigrants*** – Nonimmigrant individuals of extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics.

  The O nonimmigrant RFE template is currently being updated and USCIS anticipates having it ready for stakeholder review very soon.

- ***EB-11 Immigrants*** – Immigrant individuals of extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics

  The EB-11 immigrant RFE template went final and was posted for stakeholder viewing from January 21, 2011 to February 4, 2011.

With Phase One getting closer to completion, USCIS is starting to identify potential classifications to undertake in Phase Two of the RFE project. Once USCIS has identified which classifications will be a part of Phase Two of the RFE Project, USCIS will notify the stakeholders accordingly. If stakeholders would like to provide comments on which classifications USCIS should undertake in Phase Two of the RFE Project, they may do so by emailing scopsrfe@dhs.gov.

Question: Bi-Specialization

Please clarify each service centers' jurisdiction and the bi-specialization process.

Response: While some forms are direct-filed to the Service Centers, many are now processed through the lockbox. Regardless of lockbox filing, however, a breakdown of the current processing locations by form type is available on www.uscis.gov. It should be noted that this is subject to change according to available resources.

Question: H-2A Period of Admission

Can USCIS provide clarification for USCIS policy "Period of Admission" for I-129/H-2A workers? During this current harvest season, individuals are experiencing problems with incorrect dates for the "Period of Admission" for Temporary Workers. Specifically, they are receiving conflicting information from USCIS offices regarding the policy for the 30-day period following the expiration of the H-2A petition.

On page 76912 of the Federal Register/Vol. 73, No. 244/Thursday, December 18, 2008/Rules and Regulations it states that one of reasons for the "Period of Admission" is so the worker can seek an extension of stay based on a subsequent offer of employment. However, after applying for a worker who is already in the U.S. and has finished work early with the old employer, the new employer receives an I-94 for the worker that has an incorrect departure date.

This is confusing, expensive, and time consuming to the constituents. Because although the USCIS policy allows a non-immigrant worker to transfer to a new employer, when that employer receives the I-94 it does not reflect a new date on which the worker should leave the U.S., rather it is the same date as the last date of the 30-day "Period of Admission" or another incorrect date.

Also, please make certain that the Service Centers are notified of the correct and current policy regarding this issue.

> **Response:** We are unaware of this situation. Officers are trained to provide new validity dates listed on the Form I-129 as well as on the temporary labor certification for extensions of H-2A status. Please provide specific case receipt numbers to USCIS for review.

Question: H-1B Cap Exemption

Recently, the USCIS California Service Center has changed its policy with regard to determining eligibility for cap exemption on the basis of "affiliation with a college or university." This has resulted in USCIS denying H-1B petitions for medical residents and fellows at teaching hospitals around the country. Without access to cap exempt petitions, many medical residents and fellows will be denied the ability to commence residency/fellowship training and/or to continue residency or fellowship training that was previously considered cap exempt but is now, upon filing an extension petition, denied and considered cap subject. We urge USCIS to take immediate action to examine this adjudication policy.

> **Response:** The California Service Center continues to follow the June 6, 2006 memo entitled, "Guidance Regarding Eligibility for Exemption from the H-1B Cap Based on §103 of the American Competitiveness in the Twenty-First Century Act of 2000 (AC21) (Public Law 106-313)." No guidance has been released to direct a change in this policy since it was released.

Question: Guidance on Material Support

Recognizing the complexity and sensitivity of these issues, can USCIS provide clarification on the status of guidance for service centers regarding material support for terrorism with reference to pending I-485 and I-730 applications?

> **Response:** USCIS guidance to the service centers continues to be based on that of the March 26, 2008 memo from Deputy Director Scharfen, as updated; currently the service centers are instructed to withhold adjudication on all of the following categories of cases, provided that the applicant is otherwise eligible for the benefit being sought and that he or she does not pose a risk to national security or danger to the community:
>
> - Cases in which individuals are inadmissible for non-duress terrorism-related inadmissibility grounds (TRIG) relating to undesignated (tier 3) terrorist organizations for which a specific exemption has not been issued;
> - Cases in which individuals are inadmissible for non-duress terrorism-related inadmissibility grounds (TRIG) relating to undesignated (tier 3) terrorist organizations for which a specific exemption has not been issued;

- Cases in which individuals are inadmissible for TRIG, other than material support; solicitation of funds or members; or having undergone military-type training under duress, related to tier 3 organizations;
- Cases in which individuals are inadmissible for having voluntarily given medical care to designated and undesignated (tier 1, 2, and 3) terrorist organizations; and
- Cases in which individuals are inadmissible as the spouses/children of aliens who are inadmissible under the above cited categories.

Voluntary TRIG activity relating to tier 1 and tier 2 organizations is not exemptible under the exemption provision at INA § 212(d)(3)(B)(i), and cases involving such activity (with the exception of the voluntary the provision of medical care) do not fall within the hold categories and are adjudicated.

There have been a number of new exemptions since the March 26, 2008 memo, and as these exemptions have become available, affected cases have been released for adjudication. These new exemptions include group-based exemptions for individuals having activities or affiliations with 10 specific groups that were not otherwise covered by the automatic relief provisions of the December 26, 2007 Consolidated Appropriations Act (CAA) (which provided that 10 specific groups were no longer to be considered terrorist organizations under the INA for activities prior to the enactment of the CAA); the Iraqi National Congress (INC); the Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP); the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK); the All Burmese Students Democratic Front (ABSDF); and the All Indian Sikh Student Federation (AISSF)-Bittu faction.. In addition, there are exemptions relating to the solicitation of funds or members for a terrorist organization under duress, and to having received military-type training under duress from or on behalf of a terrorist organization. As additional exemptions become available, the service centers will be instructed to release those cases for consideration of those exemptions and for final adjudication.

Question: Use of G-325A

It would be a huge help for our clients if USCIS would accept a faxed or scanned signature on the G-325 for I-130 applications and on the DS-230 and the form that names an agent for the DS-230 applicant. The client could be required to bring the documents with original signature to the interview. This will have to happen for all signatures when USCIS goes to all electronic applications anyway. Currently our clients have to pay high mailing fees and wait sometimes months for these forms to travel to and from the foreign beneficiary.

Response: A properly completed Form G-325A is required from beneficiaries of spousal Form I-130s. However, where the beneficiary for a spousal Form I-130 is residing overseas and has failed to submit a signed G-325A, USCIS will not issue a Request for Evidence [RFEs] to obtain the missing beneficiary signature but will adjudicate the Form I-130. The signature may be collected at the immigrant visa interview.

With regard to the Form DS-230, this is the Department of State's Application for Immigrant Visa and Alien Registration. Therefore concerns regarding acceptable DS-230 documents should be presented to the Department of State.

Citizenship & Engagement

Question: Civic Integration

What programs are being sponsored that promote American civic values among both immigrant and native born? It is very challenging, especially if you serve a poor low literate community, to promote immigrant civic integration when the native-born community itself is disengaged.

Response: USCIS recognizes that civic integration must be a two way street. Immigrants have responsibilities to exercise their civic duties, learn English and become vested members of the community. But communities should also play an active role in providing welcoming environments, and helping immigrants navigate their new home.

USCIS aims to use the citizenship process to raise awareness of the importance of citizenship and integration, not only to the immigrants themselves, but to communities and our nation as a whole. Our FY 2011 Citizenship and Integration Grant Program has listed several strategic program priorities, including "Whether an application incorporates engagement with the receiving community".

Additionally, several current USCIS Citizenship and Integration Grant Program recipients are implementing innovative program elements that connect immigrants and the receiving community. We plan to highlight these promising practices as examples for other organizations.

USCIS has also increased its commitment to raise the visibility and celebration of naturalization ceremonies. To this end, USCIS builds partnerships with local organizations to hold special naturalization ceremonies involving the broader community to collectively celebrate the achievement of immigrants becoming new citizens – and the importance of this act as a reflection of the nation's history, and our shared future as citizens.

There are many best practices that both state and local governments are utilizing, as well as non-governmental organizations. Examples can be found at: Migration Policy Institute, E Pluribus Unum Awards; Welcoming America; National League of Cities, Municipal Action for Immigrant Integration