are among the factors that may account for some of these differences. The current project investigated whether personality traits were associated with trajectories of cognitive decline, and whether the associations were different before and after dementia diagnosis. The data were analyzed using linear mixed effect regression models. Across study aims was a focus on replicability and generalizability. Each question was addressed in four independent longitudinal studies (EAS, MAP, ROS, SATSA), and then meta-analyzed using random effects meta-analysis, providing estimates of heterogeneity. As expected, we detected evidence for cognitive decline in all four samples. Results also indicated that neuroticism and openness were associated with total cognitive function. and openness was associated with decline post dementia diagnosis.  

ASSESSING PERSONALITY IN DAILY LIFE: VARIABILITY BETWEEN AND WITHIN PERSONS  
Giselle Ferguson,1 Giancarlo Pasquini,2 Andreas Neubauer,1 and Stacey Scott,2 1. Stony Brook University, Stony Brook University, New York, United States, 2. Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, New York, United States, 3. Leibniz Institute for Research and Information in Education, Frankfurt, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany  
Trait personality measures may not be able to detect subtle personality changes and fluctuations which may be indicative of cognitive impairment. Measuring personality in daily life may allow sufficient sensitivity to capture this within-person variability. Eighty-six older adults from the Einstein Aging Study completed items assessing daily extraversion and neuroticism for a median of 17 days. Using separate unconditional models, we calculated the proportions of variance in daily extraversion and neuroticism that were due to between-person and within-person variability. Variability in daily extraversion was relatively evenly related to between-person differences and within-person fluctuation (Intra-Class Correlation [ICC] = 0.376), but the majority of variability in daily neuroticism was at the between-person level (ICC = 0.730). Thus, although these daily assessments were sensitive enough to capture within-person variability in personality in daily life, different traits may exhibit more or less of this variability.  

PERSONALITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC PREDICTORS OF MIDLIFE COGNITIVE FUNCTIONING IN MEXICAN-ORIGIN ADULTS  
Katherine Lawson,1 Angelina Sutin,2 and Richard Robins,3 1. University of California, Davis, University of California, Davis, California, United States, 2. Florida State University College of Medicine, Tallahassee, Florida, United States, 3. University of California, Davis, California, United States  
The present study aims to identify personality and socioeconomic (e.g., education, per capita income, economic stress) factors that contribute to midlife cognitive functioning across middle adulthood. Specifically, we examined how the growth trajectories of personality and socioeconomic factors across 12 years predict subsequent cognitive functioning, using data from a large sample of Mexican-origin adults (N=1,110; median age at Time 1=37 years, age range at Time 1=26-65). Personality was assessed using the Big Five Inventory, which assesses the Big Five domains as well as specific facets of each domain; economic stress was assessed using measures of negative economic events (e.g., job loss) and economic hardship (e.g., difficulty paying bills). Cognitive functioning was assessed using the NIH Cognitive Toolbox with measures of memory, language, and executive function. Findings from this work will help identify intervention targets for promoting healthy cognitive aging in midlife and beyond in Mexican-origin adults.  

BENCHMARKING AGE-FRIENDLY UNIVERSITY PRACTICES: AFU INVENTORY AND CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY (ICCS) STUDY INSIGHTS  
Chair: Joann Montepare Co-Chair: Nina Silverstein  
The Age-Friendly University (AFU) initiative endorsed by GSA’s Academy for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE) provides institutions of higher education with guiding principles for addressing the needs of aging populations. Benchmarks are now needed for assessing age-friendly academic, workplace, and physical campus environments, perceptions of campus constituents, and recommendations for advancing age inclusivity. This symposium will discuss what the AFU Inventory and Campus Climate Survey (ICCS) administered to a national sample of colleges and universities is revealing about the study of age-friendliness in higher education. The sample includes data from over 10,000 faculty, staff, students, and older learners surveyed in 2020-21. Whibley will introduce the conceptual model that served as the foundation for the ICCS, with special attention to the need to assess and compare “objective” age-friendly practices with “subjective” perceptions of these practices. Bowen will describe the utility of examining age-friendliness
across institutional units with different functions: outreach-engagement, personnel, physical environment, research, services-resources, student affairs, and teaching-learning. Beaulieu will present data demonstrating the importance of assessing perceptions of specific constituent groups including faculty, staff, students, and lifelong learners. Montepare will discuss insights gained about the definition and manifestation of what it means to be ageist, age-friendly, and age-inclusive in higher education. Silverstein will describe strengths and challenges observed across campuses along with recommendations and promising new directions for advancing age inclusivity in higher education.

TOWARD A MODEL OF AGE INCLUSIVITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Susan Whitbourne, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, United States

The AFU principles clearly state the aspiration of promoting age inclusivity in higher education within the context of the UN Sustainability Development Goals. With these principles as a starting point, the Age-Friendly Campus Climate Inventory and Survey were developed to assess the extent to which AFU principles are put into practice (Inventory) and how campus constituencies perceive these practices. Based on social ecological models, a framework for measuring age inclusivity was developed in which practices ("objective environment") are compared to perceptions ("subjective environment"). Participating campuses (N=29) completed the inventory for each major executive unit, providing scores that were grouped by major campus functions, including research, teaching, community engagement, and support. By comparing these scores with perceptions of each function by samples of constituencies of faculty, staff, and students, it is possible to test the person-environment match as conceptualized by social ecological models providing important clarification for the AFU principles.

TAKING A CAMPUS-WIDE VIEW OF AGE-FRIENDLY PRACTICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Lauren Bowen,1 Nina Silverstein,2 Susan Whitbourne,3 and Joann Montepare4 1. University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, Massachusetts, United States, 2. University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts, United States, 3. University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, United States, 4. Lasell University, Newton, Massachusetts, United States

The first AFU principle is to “encourage the participation of older adults in all the core activities of the university, including educational and research programs.” As this suggests, a crucial goal of age inclusivity in higher education is to resist the siloing of older adults and age-inclusive efforts in age-specific programs and cohorts. In response, the Age-Friendly Inventory and Campus Climate Survey (ICCS) assessment was designed to assess age-inclusivity across seven areas of institutional activity: outreach & engagement, personnel, physical environment, research, services & resources, student affairs, and teaching & learning. By restructuring and expanding the “pillars” of institutional activity outlined by AFU principles, the ICCS presents two key advantages for benchmarking AFU practices: (1) it traces age-inclusivity across many facets of institutional operations; and (2) it prompts participants and report readers to recognize their role in current and potential age-inclusive efforts, regardless of their role or department on campus.

EXPLORING PERCEPTIONS OF AGE FRIENDLINESS ACROSS DIFFERENT CAMPUS CONSTITUENT GROUPS
Celeste Beaulieu,1 Nina Silverstein,1 Lauren Bowen,2 Susan Whitbourne,3 and Joann Montepare4 1. University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, Massachusetts, United States, 2. University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, Massachusetts, United States, 3. University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, United States, 4. Lasell University, Newton, Massachusetts, United States

College campuses are typically considered as environments for adults ages 18-24, even though campuses are comprised of faculty, staff, students, and lifelong learners of all ages. Each group may experience the campus environment differently due to their differing roles. Faculty, staff and students from 21 participating designated Age Friendly Universities across the country answered survey questions on age friendliness, AFU awareness, and on campus practice items. Crosstab analyses show that constituent groups are equally aware of their university as an AFU (6% of each group). Students perceived their university as more age friendly (M=3.47, SD=0.73) compared to faculty and staff, the latter having the lowest perceived friendliness (M=3.27, SD=0.63). Specific age friendly practices show that staff members had markedly different perceptions of the institution’s age friendly practices. AFUs need to consider higher education environments as workplaces as well as learning centers to make policies age friendly for all groups.

ON BEING AGEIST, AGE-FRIENDLY, AGE-INCLUSIVE: DIFFERENTIATING CORE CONSTRUCTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS
Joann Montepare, Lasell University, Newton, Massachusetts, United States

The pioneering Age-Friendly University (AFU) initiative has called for institutions of higher education to respond to the needs of older, more age-diverse populations through new approaches to programs, practices, and partnerships. In exploring in more detail what it means for a campus to be age-friendly, the national AFU Inventory and Campus Climate Survey (ICCS) study has raised questions about how core theoretical concepts are defined and manifested. Using observations from the ICCS study, this presentation will discuss tensions among constructs (e.g., does being age-friendly indicate the absence of ageist attitudes; are age-inclusive practices by design age-friendly?) and how differentiating these constructs better can help higher education focus its efforts in more intentional and productive ways.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TOWARD INCREASING AGE-INCLUSIVITY
Nina Silverstein, University of Massachusetts Boston, Boston, Massachusetts, United States

Some areas of current campus practice better align with AFU principles than others. It may be that age-friendly practices already implemented by campus administrators