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Eighty-nine percent of the freshmen on mandatory meal plans are expected to fulfill their minimum consumption requirement before the end of the term, according to projections released Wednesday by George E. Hartwell, Associate Director for Housing and Food Services.

"I think the freshmen are a little smarter," commented Hartwell. "They've been through this once." Based on figures derived on Monday, Hartwell expects approximately 378 freshmen to use at least the minimum number of points required while about 47 will be expected to exceed their minimum requirement.

During the fall term, 355 freshmen used at least the minimum number of points required while 87 did not.

"If asked if there would be any reduction in the amount of minimum points required, as has happened during the fall, Hartwell replied, "I don't expect that they will change at this stage of the game. Even if the numbers of freshmen who would not meet minimum point requirements were to climb, I don't think that those numbers of [points required] will change."

Hartwell noted that, of the 47 freshmen who might not fulfill their requirement, 25 were from east campus dormitories. Of the 87 members of the Class of 1984 who did not meet the minimum last term, 24 were from east campus living groups.

"I don't know who will stay away because of it; I hope no one," Gallagher commented.

Gallagher believes freshmen will not take into account the extra $300 they will have to earn or borrow, as they have no previous amount with which to make comparison. Moreover, he considered the increase slightly high, he noted.

Gallagher also mentioned that and is designed to insure "basic literacy in major forms of intellectual discourse," said Rosovsky. The curriculum had encouraged many of Harvard's best senior professors to teach undergraduate courses, according to Rosovsky. In addition, it has added new senior professors to teaching at Harvard, he noted.

There was some student criticism when the program was first considered in 1978. The Harvard Crimson opposed its rigid requirement in an editorial. This criticism has since declined considerably.

Still, some professors wonder whether the core curriculum can remain a viable program. The general education curriculum suffered as enthusiasm among the faculty for the program waned. There is concern that the lack of incentives for faculty to teach core courses will hurt the program. "I don't see, frankly, what the incentives are for a faculty member to give a core course rather than a departmental course," said Stanley H. Hoffman, Professor of Government at Harvard. "One spends much more time on a core course than on a routine departmental course," he continued.

Some administrators are also concerned that future deans and senior professors may lack enthusiasm for the core curriculum. "A lot will depend on what happens when we have a change in presidents and in deans," said Edward T. Wilson, the director of the core curriculum. He noted that the general education program began to suffer after the resignation of President James Conant, a supporter of the program. Rosovsky agrees. "We are still the parents of this program. Gradually we will disappear from the scene. The successor generation will be important to watch," he said.