**Inspectors General Checklist**

|  |
| --- |
| **UNIFORM INSPECTION 1020**  |
| This checklist applies to all levels and types of commands. This uniform inspection checklist may be used as a guide for all personally owned uniform items as detailed in MCO 10120.34H and MCBul 10120 (ensure appropriate fiscal year is utilized). The checklist may be adjusted as necessary to meet the needs of the unit/inspector. This checklist is not meant to be used for organizational and special issue clothing/gear. All elements of a question must be satisfied to be found compliant. |
| **Functional Area Sponsor:** MCUB | **Name of Command** |
| **Subject Matter Expert:** Ms. Mary Boyt | **Date** |
| (DSN) 278-6889 (COML) 703-784-6889 | **Inspector** |
| **Revised:** 1 January 2020  | **Final Assessment****Discrepancies: Findings:**  |
| **Overall Comments:** Place Here  |
| Subsection 1 – UNIFORM INSPECTION |
| 0101 |  | Did the cover fit properly? a. Too small  b. Too large Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3005; TM 10120-15/1, chap 2, sect II, par 6 chap 3, sect II, par 6 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0102 |  | Was the cover properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Wrinkled
3. Visor/chin strap not polished/cleaned
4. Visor/chin strap cracked

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6 and 3005 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0103 |  | Was the cover worn properly? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3005; TM 10120-15/1, chap 2, sect II, par 6 chap 3, sect II, par 6 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0104 |  | Did personnel appearance/grooming meet Marine Corpsstandards?1. Hair was improperly trimmed/shaved/styled
2. Hair/hairstyle interfered with the proper wear of headgear
3. Unnatural, eccentric hair color did not complement

Marine's complexion1. Conspicuous artificial hair color or wig was worn
2. Improper shave
3. Moustache was improperly trimmed
4. Cosmetics (including finger nail polish) were improperly used
5. Unauthorized/eccentric or conspicuous jewelry/wrist

watches/other personal items were worn/displayed. i. Dirty hands/fingernails/fingernails too long/improper nail polish worn Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1004, MARADMINs 622/15 & 207/13 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0105 |  | Were all visible tattoos in compliance with the reference and properlyrecorded in the Marine's SRB/OQR?Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1004 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0106 |  | Were ribbons/medals/badges properly worn?1. Incorrect precedence
2. Inverted
3. Incorrectly positioned on uniform
4. Items worn inconsistent w/ OQR/SRB entries
5. One-third or more of a ribbon concealed by coat lapel
6. Excessive number of badges worn
7. Attachments incorrectly positioned
8. REQUAL bars missing or incorrect
9. Ribbon bar conspicuous

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, chap 5 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0107 |  | Did the uniform shirt fit properly?1. Collar too large/small
2. Sleeves too long/short
3. Body too loose/tight
4. Unauthorized alterations
5. Optional shirt (if worn) does not have certification approval number

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1008 and 3026, TM 10120-15/1, chap 2, sect II, par 1 chap 3, sect II, par 3 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0108 |  | Was the uniform shirt properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Faded
3. Wrinkled
4. Collar stays visible
5. Buttons missing/damaged
6. Double creases

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6 and 3026.1f-g |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0109 |  | Was the necktie/neck tab properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Wrinkled
3. Frayed
4. Non-regulation
5. Pre-tied tie metal hook visible

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3020  |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0110 |  | Was the tie clasp correctly positioned? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3021 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0111 |  | Was the tie clasp properly maintained?1. Tarnished
2. Damaged

Reference: MCO 1020.34H |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0112 |  | Was the tie clasp regulation/of type authorized for rank? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3021 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0113 |  | Did the uniform coat fit properly?1. Collar too loose/tight
2. Collar improperly finished
3. Too loose/tight in shoulders
4. Too loose/tight in chest
5. Too loose/tight in waist
6. Sleeves too long/short
7. Front closure overlap insufficient/excessive
8. Back vent overlap insufficient/excessive
9. Vertical edge of back vent closure not straight
10. Coat/skirt excessively flared
11. Horizontal edges of front/rear panels not even
12. Belt too long/short
13. Belt keeper missing

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3006 and 3002, TM 10120-15/1, chap 2, sect II, par 3 chap 3, sect II, par 1 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0114 |  | Was the uniform coat properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Faded stitching
3. Excessive wear
4. Buckle tarnished/scratched
5. Buttons tarnished/missing/damaged
6. Improperly pressed

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6, par 3006 and par 10102 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0115 |  | Did uniform trousers/slacks/skirt fit properly?1. Too loose/tight in waist
2. Too loose/tight in hips
3. Length too long/short
4. Not properly hemmed
5. Pockets flared
6. Double creases

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3027, par 3028 and 3034 TM 1012015/1B, chap 2, sect II, par 2 chap 3, sect II, par 2 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0116 |  | Were the uniform trousers/slacks/skirt properly maintained?1. Excessive wear
2. Soiled
3. Faded stitching
4. Buttons missing/damaged
5. Wrinkled
6. Ornamented gold lace stripe tarnished/damaged

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6 and 10102 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0117 |  | Were the uniform coat and trousers/coat and skirt worn of matching Materials (when applicable)? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.7,2002 and 2004 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0118 |  | Were the uniform shoes worn regulation/of authorized style for rank? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3012 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0119 |  | Were the uniform shoes properly maintained?1. Not polished
2. Spotted/dusty/damaged
3. Heels worn
4. Uppers cracked
5. Leather heels
6. Double soles/heels
7. Metal taps

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6, 3012, and 10107 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0120 |  | Were authorized socks/hose worn?Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3029, MCBul 10120 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0121 |  | Did the all-weather coat fit properly?1. Too tight/loose in chest
2. Too tight/loose in waist
3. Too tight/loose in back
4. Too tight/loose in shoulders
5. Sleeves too long/short
6. Half-belt/belt too long/short
7. Length too long/short
8. Horizontal edges of front/back
9. Panels not even

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3001; TM 10120-15/1, chap 2, sect II, par 4 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0122 |  | Was the all-weather coat properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Excessive wear
3. Faded stitching
4. Wrinkled
5. Improperly pressed

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6, 3001, and 10105 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0123 |  | Were the gloves properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Discolored
3. Frayed
4. Non-regulation

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6 and 3013 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0124 |  | Were rank insignia/service and trouser stripes properly maintained?1. Soiled/tarnished
2. Scratched/frayed/damaged
3. Improperly sewn to uniform

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6, 4004, 4005, 4006, 4008 and 4009, TM 10120-15/1, chap 2, sect II, par 2 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0125 |  | Were rank insignia/service and trouser stripes properly worn?1. Incorrectly positioned on uniform
2. Inconsistent with grade authorized
3. Inconsistent with years of service completed

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 4004, 4005, 4006, 4008 and 4009 TM 10120-15/1, chap 2, sect II, par 2 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0126 |  | Was the branch of service insignia properly maintained?1. Item worn was non-regulation
2. Needed retouching/refinishing
3. Retouched/refinished with unauthorized coloring agent

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 4001 and 10106 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0127 |  | Was the branch of service insignia properly worn?1. Incorrectly positioned on uniform
2. Type worn not type specified for a particular uniform item

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 4001 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0128 |  | Was the web belt of proper length? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3002 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0129 |  | Was the web belt properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Tarnished brass (brass tip only)
3. Frayed

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6, par 3002 and 10109 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0130 |  | Was the coat/web belt buckle properly worn?1. Buckle not properly fastened/locked
2. Buckle not properly aligned with coat
3. Flap/shirt front/fly front
4. Buckle not properly centered (all-weather coat)
5. Belt not the proper length
6. Wrong belt worn for the uniform

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3001 and 3002 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0131 |  | Were holes/cuts in uniform items properly repaired?Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6, 10114, and 10116 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0132 |  | Did uniform items have Irish pennants/lint showing? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.6 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0133 |  | Did uniform items and accessory items bear approval identification? Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1005.3 and 1007 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0134 |  | Were uniform items properly altered/had authorized alterations beenmade?Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1008; TM-120-15/B; TM 10120-15/1; TMO 10120-15/1 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0135 |  | Were discrepancies found in identification tag sets?1. Incomplete I.D. tag sets worn/displayed
2. I.D. tags lacked prescribed information
3. I.D. tags contained incorrect information
4. Information on I.D. tags not in prescribed format

Reference: MCO P1070.12K, chap 7 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0136 |  | Were identification card discrepancies found?1. I.D. cards were missing
2. I.D. cards contained incorrect information
3. I.D. cards lacked prescribed information
4. I.D. cards were damaged/mutilated

Reference: MCO P5512.11D, par 1A, par 2 and 7 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0137 |  | Was the hand salute correctly rendered?1. Bent wrist
2. Drooping thumb

Reference: NAVMC 2691, par 2-1(E), chap 5 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0138 |  | (Officers Only) Does the white strip collar fit properly?1. Not overlapped in front
2. Excessive/insufficient protrusion above collar

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3007 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0139 |  | (Officers Only) Was the white strip collar properly maintained?1. Soiled
2. Frayed
3. Discolored
4. Wrinkled

Reference: MCO P102030.34G, par 10101 |
| Result | Comments  |
| Subsection 2 – ENLISTED CLOTHING & EQUIPMENT |
| 0201 |  | Was clothing properly maintained?1. Improperly pressed
2. Dirty/soiled
3. Unserviceable
4. Missing/unaccountable for

 Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 1000.5; chap 2-3, 5, and 10 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0202 |  | Was clothing properly marked?1. Unmarked
2. Illegible
3. Lacked neatness
4. Improperly remarked
5. SRB entry missing remarked clothing

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 10200 and 10201 |
| Result | Comments  |
| Subsection 3 – OFFICER SWORD & ACCESSORIES |
| 0301 |  | Are the sword and accoutrements properly worn?1. Scabbard not properly hooked to leather sling
2. Sword knot not properly tied to hilt
3. Web shoulder sling visible outside coat
4. Wrong sword for grade

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3032 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0302 |  | Are the sword and accoutrements properly maintained?1. Tarnished/not polished
2. Soiled
3. Damaged
4. Leather accoutrements were on-regulation color

Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 10112 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0303 |  | Is the sword of regulation length for the individual carrying it?Reference: MCO 1020.34H, par 3032 |
| Result | Comments  |
| 0304 |  | Was the sword manual properly executed?Reference: NAVMC 2691, chap 5 |
| Result | Comments  |