

RICS Regulation Practice Alert: Use of RICS designations, status and logos, and integrity of assessment submissions

Purpose of this Practice Alert

RICS is issuing this further Regulation Practice Alert to reinforce its previous communications regarding the correct and lawful use of RICS designations, membership status and logos.

Despite the [Practice Alert issued in December 2024](#), RICS continues to identify widespread and persistent misrepresentation, particularly on social media platforms such as LinkedIn, on professional websites and in digital marketing materials.

RICS has also identified increasing concerns relating to the integrity of assessment submissions submitted by candidates.

This Practice Alert should be treated as a formal regulatory warning.

Who this applies to

This Practice Alert applies to:

- all RICS members
- all RICS candidates
- all RICS-regulated firms
- counsellors and supervisors, and
- any individual or entity holding themselves out as connected with RICS.

Regulatory position

Only individuals who have formally attained AssocRICS, MRICS or FRICS are entitled to use:

- the designations MRICS, FRICS or AssocRICS (respectively)
- any wording that implies chartered status or RICS membership, and
- the RICS logo or any RICS branding.

RICS has clear rules and guidelines on the [use of the RICS logo](#).

Candidates are not entitled to use MRICS, FRICS or AssocRICS, and must not represent themselves as such, whether explicitly or implicitly.

Any representation that may mislead a reasonable person into believing that an individual is an RICS member, a chartered surveyor or otherwise authorised by RICS is unacceptable, regardless of intent.

Explicit guidance for RICS candidates

RICS recognises that candidates may wish to reference their progression towards membership. The following guidance applies and must be followed strictly.

Permitted descriptions

Candidates, trainees and students are members of Attached Classes of membership.

Candidates, trainees and students are not permitted to use RICS designations, trademarks or logos in any form. This includes use on social media profiles (including LinkedIn), letterheads, stationery, email signatures, websites, CVs, business cards and marketing materials.

Members of the Attached Classes must ensure that they do not mislead any person into believing that they have obtained an RICS designation when they have not.

Where reference to status is required, candidates enrolled for the Assessment of Professional Competence (APC) or other RICS assessments may refer to themselves as:

- 'trainee surveyor' or 'candidate for membership' (chartered pathway)
- 'trainee associate' (associate pathway) or
- 'student'.

Prohibited descriptions

Candidates must not:

- use MRICS, FRICS or AssocRICS
- describe themselves as a 'Chartered Surveyor', including with qualifiers such as 'candidate', 'pending', 'in progress' or similar
- use phrases such as 'RICS-qualified', 'RICS-accredited', 'RICS-registered' or 'Chartered (RICS pathway)'
- display the RICS logo or branding in any form, or
- use wording, formatting or layout that places 'RICS' immediately after their name in a manner implying post-nominal status.

Examples of incorrect use of designations by candidates

- ✗ John Doe, MRICS APC candidate
- ✗ John Doe, APC candidate for MRICS
- ✗ John Doe, RICS member
- ✗ John Doe, RICS candidate
- ✗ John Doe, aspiring RICS member

Context and prominence

Any reference to candidacy must:

- appear in a secondary or explanatory context
- not be used as a headline title or post-nominal, and
- not be positioned in a way that could reasonably be interpreted as a professional designation.

Use of artificial intelligence (AI), plagiarism and assessment integrity

RICS has identified an increasing number of assessment submissions that appear to contain plagiarised material, content generated using AI tools or work that is otherwise not the candidate's own.

All assessment submissions, including case studies, summaries of experience, competencies and final assessments, must represent the candidate's own work, experience and professional judgement, as set out in [RICS' published guidance for candidates](#).

The use of AI tools to generate, materially draft or substantially alter assessment submissions, where this results in work that is not the candidate's own, is not permitted.

Copying or closely paraphrasing material from third-party sources, templates, online content or other candidates' submissions without proper attribution constitutes plagiarism and is prohibited.

RICS uses a range of methods to identify non-original work, including plagiarism detection tools, forensic review and comparative analysis.

Where concerns are identified:

- submissions may be rejected or declared invalid
- assessment outcomes may be withheld or overturned, and
- matters may be referred to RICS Regulation for consideration under the RICS [Rules of Conduct](#).

Candidates are reminded that dishonest or misleading conduct during the assessment process may result in regulatory investigation, and may impact future assessment eligibility and membership.

Responsibilities of counsellors and supervisors

Counsellors and supervisors play an important role in maintaining the integrity of RICS' assessment and regulatory framework.

RICS' [published guidance](#) makes clear that counsellors are expected to provide oversight and support, while taking reasonable steps to ensure that candidates' submissions are:

- the candidate's own work

- truthful, accurate and based on genuine experience
- prepared in accordance with RICS assessment requirements and
- consistent with the candidate's correct membership status.

Counsellors should also ensure that candidates refer to themselves appropriately and do not misuse RICS designations, logos or wording that may mislead others as to their status.

Where RICS identifies repeated concerns, insufficient oversight or systemic issues, matters may be referred to RICS Regulation and may result in a review of the individual's continued suitability to act as a counsellor.

Common areas of concern

RICS continues to identify recurring issues including, but not limited to:

- misuse of protected designations by candidates or non-members
- ambiguous wording on LinkedIn and other social media platforms
- misuse of RICS logos or branding
- inaccurate CVs, email signatures and marketing materials, and
- plagiarised or AI-generated assessment submissions.

RICS reminds individuals that social media platforms are public representations and are treated no differently from websites or printed materials for regulatory purposes.

Immediate action required

All members and candidates must urgently review:

- LinkedIn and other social media profiles
- CVs and professional biographies
- websites, email signatures and marketing materials, and
- assessment submissions and supporting documentation.

Any incorrect, misleading or ambiguous reference to RICS status, designations or logos, or issues regarding assessment integrity, must be corrected immediately.

Regulatory consequences

Failure to comply with this Practice Alert may result in regulatory action, including:

- disciplinary investigation
- rejection or invalidation of assessment submissions
- restrictions on assessment progression or future eligibility, and
- disciplinary outcomes, including sanctions, conditions or removal from membership.

RICS will not accept lack of awareness, reliance on third-party providers or historic usage as defences.

Final reminder

The reputation of RICS and the trust placed in its designations and assessment processes depend on accurate, honest and transparent presentation. RICS expects full and immediate compliance.

If you have concerns about the practice of an RICS member or RICS-regulated firm, please raise this with RICS by submitting your concerns to complaints@rics.org.

Good practice reminder: RICS members have a professional duty to promptly disclose the details of any regulated member that you reasonably believe may have breached RICS' rules or professional standards. The duty to speak up is an important part of the profession's moral compass. Think of it as protecting the reputation of your profession by helping RICS to uphold the public interest. Please email concerns to complaints@rics.org.