

CONFIRMED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 SEPTEMBER 2021

PRESENT:

Ms J Allen (Chair)	Mr M Lilley
Ms V Brown	Mr S Kothari
Mr I Hall	Mr J Warner

APOLOGIES: None

IN ATTENDANCE:	AGENDA ITEM
Mr A Bush, KPMG	All except 1 and 18
Ms M Boryslawskij, University Secretary	All
Ms L Bostock, KPMG	All except 1 and 18
Mr R Calvert, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations	All except 1 and 2
Ms D Harry, Chief Finance and Planning Officer	3 to 10, 16 and 22
Prof. K Kerrigan, Pro Vice-Chancellor for Business and Enterprise	12i
Dr N McKay, Dean of Students	16
Prof. C Moss, Group Director of BESE, Business Engagement, Skills & Employability	12i
Mr R Nurennabi, Head of Pension Development and Payroll	11
Mr M Redfern, Grant Thornton	All except 1 and 18
Mr T Russell, Head of Strategic Insight and Data	16
Prof. D Shepherd, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching and Learning	16
Ms K Stead, Head of Planning, Risk and Insurance	9 and 10
Mr J Sullivan, KPMG	12iii and 12iv
Ms A Temple, Governance Senior Adviser (Committee Secretary)	All

Agenda item 1	Private Meeting of Committee Members	Minute Ref A/4/21/1
---------------	---	---------------------

1.1 The Committee members met privately.

1.2 Mr Ian Hall, Mr Sameer Kothari and Mr Matt Lilley were welcomed to their first meeting of the Committee.

1.3 There were no substantive matters discussed that would not be covered during the meeting.

Agenda item 2	Private Meeting of Committee Members and Auditors	Minute Ref A/4/21/2
---------------	--	---------------------

2.1 The Committee met privately with representatives from the external and internal auditors.

2.2 In relation to the external audit, Mr M Redfern confirmed that he was content with the progress being made with the external audit for the financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2021.

2.3 A member asked whether the internal auditors had any concerns about managements capacity to implement the recommendations made in the internal audit reports in a timely manner. Mr A Bush suggested that members might wish to investigate with management whether there were any concerns about implementing the recommendations made in phase 1 and phase 2 of the Apprenticeships audit (minute A/4/21/11.5 refers).

Agenda item 4	Declaration of Interests	Minute Ref A/4/21/3
3.1 There were no declarations of interest.		
Agenda item 5.1 and 5.2 Paper Ref A/3/21/M	Minutes of Previous Meeting	Minute Ref A/4/21/4
4.1 The minutes and the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2021 were <u>approved</u> subject to amending minute A/3/21/13.1v to: “the Committee expressed concern a desire that updates were should be provided for all high priority recommendations . In particular, concern was expressed that there was no update for the high priority recommendations in the (2018/19 IT operational controls and resilience review). In relation to these high priority recommendations, it was agreed that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations would follow-up again with relevant manager to ensure that the tracker was updated.”		
Agenda item 6 Paper Ref A/4/21/6	Matters Arising/Audit and Risk Committee Action Tracker, Version 16 September 2021	Minute Ref A/4/21/5
5.1 A/3/21/5.2 (20 May 2021): Data Breach: A minute confidential to the Committee was recorded.		
5.2 A minute confidential to the Committee was recorded.		
5.3 It had previously been agreed to report all data breach notifications that were made to the Information Commissioner’s Office to the next Audit and Risk Committee meeting. It was <u>agreed</u> that going forward the Committee should instead receive a report on GDPR compliance which would also include an overview of subject access requests/freedom of information requests. A member indicated that it would be helpful to include trend data in the report and provide a RAG assessment of each data breach incident. It was <u>agreed</u> that where a data breach was serious the University should continue to report details of the incident to the committee, including any mitigations put in place to prevent/reduce the likelihood of future incidents.		
5.4 Minute A/3/21/6 (20 May 2021): Auditor Audit Matters and Sector Issues Update: It was <u>agreed</u> to formally schedule updates from the auditors on sector issues and audit matters twice yearly at the September and March meetings.		
5.5 A/3/21/10.4 (20 May 2021): Unused internal audit days for 2020/21: Use of the unused days would be considered under agenda item A/4/21/15.		
5.6 Minute A/3/21/14 (20 May 2021): External Audit: The Audit Plan for Sheffield Hallam University, Year Ended 31 July 2021: It was noted that Grant Thornton had reported in the private meeting with the Committee that the external audit was progressing well. Mr Redfern confirmed that information requested had been provided by management in a timely manner and work was on target for completion within agreed timescales.		
Agenda Item 8	Appointment of Deputy Chair	Minute Ref A/4/21/6
6.1 The Independent Governor members of the Audit and Risk Committee had been contacted to seek expressions of interest to take the role of Deputy Chair. There had been a vacancy for the role holder since February 2021. There had been no expressions of interest. It was noted that there was no formal constitutional requirement to appoint a deputy chair and the Committee could agree a member to chair the meeting if, and when, the chair was unable to undertake the role. It was also noted that there was no constitutional restriction that would prevent the externally co-opted members from chairing the meeting, however, a logistical issue could arise, in that the chair was required to report on the Committee’s business to the Board.		

Agenda item 9
Paper Ref
A/4/21/9

Internal Audit on Risk Management

Minute Ref
A/4/21/7

- 7.1 The Committee received the 2020/21 internal audit report on risk management which had been rated 'significant assurance with minor improvements required'. It was noted that KPMG undertook a review of risk management annually and each year they focused on different aspects of the process. The report would be used by KMPG to inform their opinion on risk management in their 2020/21 annual report. In this review KPMG had applied their 'soft controls' methodology to review the extent to which risk management was embedded in the culture of the University. They had applied this through a survey of the extended ULT and this was an activity that they intended to repeat as part of future risk management reviews in order to identify trends and provide assurance that implementation of their recommendations was strengthening the risk management culture at the University. KPMG had identified two medium priority recommendations:
1. that the University's risk appetite had not been reviewed since 2018 and that risk registers did not clearly link to the University's risk appetite levels.
 2. due to the Covid-19 pandemic, training and risk management workshops had not been undertaken in the last year, although support and communication was provided on an ad hoc basis. As well as enforcing compliance with University procedures, workshops would be an opportunity to convey feedback from committee discussions, the University's risk appetite, and good practice across the University.

- 7.2 Members commented as follows:
1. the soft controls approach applied was helpful and would provide a good baseline for further assessments;
 2. the report indicated that there was a good risk management process in place;
 3. it was important that strategic discussions were held within the context of the University's risk appetite;
 4. it was important that the articulation of the University's risk appetite clearly enabled staff to identify when an activity was not in line with the risk appetite and that staff know what to do if an activity was out of line with the risk appetite;
 5. it was important that the risk appetite was well communicated;
 6. it was important that the risk appetite was agreed by the Board of Governors. It was noted that the statement would be developed during 2021/22 and would be considered by the University Leadership Team, then Audit and Risk Committee before consideration by the Board. It was suggested that use of a current/live case study, perhaps the estates masterplan development work, would help drive thinking in relation to the risk appetite statement;
 7. how would the reflective questions be utilised? The Chief Finance and Planning Officer suggested that these could be used as part of the regular review of the Corporate Risk Register by the University Leadership Team.

Agenda Item 10
Paper Ref
A/4/21/10
Confidential

Corporate Risks Update

Minute Ref
A/4/21/8

- 8.1 Ms KStead, Head of Planning, Risk and Insurance presented a report on risk management which the Committee received as part of its remit to provide assurance to the Board of Governors that the University was exercising adequate control of risks through the active planning, management and assessment of risk in relation to its activities. The Committee noted that a review of the corporate risk register had been undertaken and an updated risk register and heatmap had been produced (Appendix 1). The assurance map had been updated to document the controls in place to manage and reduce the University's risks, including its response to the additional assurances required by OfS during this period (snapshot provided as Appendix 2).

8.2 A minute confidential to the Committee was recorded.

8.3 A minute confidential to the Committee was recorded.

Agenda item 11
Paper Ref
A/4/21/11
Confidential

Update on TPS

Minute Ref A/4/21/9

9.1 Mr R Nurennabi, Head of Pension Development and Payroll presented a report on the TPS investigation and a minute confidential to the Committee was recorded.

9.2 A minute confidential to the Committee was recorded.

9.3 New members were welcome to request any background papers about the matter.

9.4 It was agreed that future updates should be 'to receive' papers with the Head of Pension Development and Payroll to attend to present by exception.

Agenda Item 12i
Paper Ref
A/4/21/12i

Internal Audit Reports: HE Apprenticeships: Phase 2

Minute Ref A/4/21/10

10.1 Prof. K Kerrigan, Pro Vice-Chancellor for Business and Enterprise and Prof. C Moss, Group Director of BESE, Business Engagement, Skills & Employability joined the meeting for the report.

10.2 The Committee noted that KPMG had undertaken an advisory audit: HE Apprenticeships: Phase 1 (Apprenticeships Funding Review) which had been received by the Committee in November 2020 (minute A/20/80 refers). This audit had focussed on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the University's current control framework. The purpose of the audit was to gain assurance that HE Apprenticeship provision delivered to date was compliant with current ESFA funding requirements, which should help mitigate risk of compliance issues if selected for an ESFA funding audit. The report presented to the Committee set out the outcomes of phase 1 of the audit which provided informal feedback and a number of recommendations. Phase 2 of the work was due to be completed in 2021.

10.3 The Committee received the 2020/21 HE Apprenticeships: Phase 2 review, which had been rated 'partial assurance with improvements required'. Phase 2 had focused on compliance with ESFA funding rules. A sample of 20 apprentices had been selected (from a population of 1,581 as at 4 February 2021 ILR data) using the ESFA's Provider Data Self Assessment sampler toolkit. Compliance testing was completed remotely using the current ESFA's funding assurance review working papers and was completed in accordance with current ESFA testing methodology.

10.4 Appendix E of the 2020/21 follow-up internal audit report (A/4/21/12vii) provided an update from management on the progress made in addressing the two Apprenticeships reviews. The update was based only on the discussions with the Head of Business Operations and Delivery and, at the time of reporting, KPMG were awaiting evidence to confirm the progress reported. KPMG had been asked to undertake a follow-up review in February 2022, and as part of this they would re-sample apprenticeships to test whether recommendations had been effectively implemented.

10.5 The Pro Vice-Chancellor for Business and Enterprise highlighted the following:

- the provision of apprenticeships at the University had grown rapidly and systems to record apprentice data had not been optimum for meeting ESFA requirements;
- the implementation of an electronic apprenticeship enrolment process using the Maytas system had improved management of apprentices;
- the internal audit work had been very helpful;
- he was confident that the new learners process was ESFA compliant i.e. the University had compliant records in place for all learners commencing apprenticeships in September 2021;
- in relation to historical data additional staff had been recruited to review this data to ensure compliance with ESFA requirements and implementation of the recommendations (minute A/4/21/2.3 above refers);

- the Head of Business Operations and Delivery had responsibility for implementing KPMG’s recommendations and the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Business and Enterprise met her on a monthly basis to review progress.

- 10.6 In response to questions the following was noted:
- the implementation of the Maytas system had been led to a significant improvement in management of apprentices’ data and additional functionality was being rolled out to help with integration to the SITS system (i.e. the student management system) and reporting;
 - was there any possibility that remedial work to existing learners’ records would not be accepted by the ESFA and what was the potential financial risk of this?* There were a number of areas which could be remediated in existing learners’ records in order to ensure full compliance with ESFA requirements, including where information was held but not in the right way. Mr A Bush, KPMG, noted that an ESFA audit would review the previous year’s records and it would be possible to address those records retrospectively where learners were still at the University. It may be more difficult if learners had left the University. Management indicated that it was difficult to quantify the financial risk exposure associated with the possible implications of an ESFA audit;
 - there was a high likelihood that the ESFA would start to audit higher education institutions in the near future. The University would be likely to receive four weeks notice of an audit and would have a further two weeks to prepare the information.

Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/12ii	12ii	Internal Audit Reports: Campus Plan: Risk Management Framework	Minute Ref A/4/21/11
---	------	---	-------------------------

- 11.1 The Committee received the final 2020/21 internal audit report on Campus Plan: Risk Management Framework which had been rated ‘significant assurance with minor improvements required’.

Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/12iii	12iii	Internal Audit Reports: Cyber Maturity Assessment	Minute Ref A/4/21/12
--	-------	--	-------------------------

- 12.1 Mr J Sullivan, KPMG joined the meeting. The Committee received the final 2020/21 internal audit report on Cyber Maturity Assessment which had been rated ‘partial assurance with improvements required’. The report noted a number of good practice areas, particularly in the areas of cyber risk management, governance and technical security controls and DTS were commended for this. The high priority recommendation related to the need ensure that offline, immutable backups were performed regularly for all key IT systems and data as the audit found that these were not being performed due to covid-19 operational restrictions. As soon as this was identified action was taken to re-introduce the required back-ups and KPMG had reviewed evidence and were confident that appropriate action had been taken. In response to questions, it was noted that:
- processes had not been followed to obtain senior staff approval for suspension of critical activities. Action in the report indicated that roles and responsibilities and the requirements for backups and disaster recovery would be communicated to relevant staff in DTS by the end of May 2021;
 - planning for full scale disaster recovery testing was on-going;
 - was the team adequately resourced to implement the recommendations?* During summer 2021 additional staff had been approved in the infrastructure and systems development teams in DTS. It was noted that there was a competitive market for IT staff.
- It was noted that KPMG would update page 4 of the report to reflect that management had agreed all of the recommendations.
A member commended KPMG on the quality of the audit work.

Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/12iv	12iv	Internal Audit Reports: Dynamics and E5 Key IT Controls	Minute Ref A/4/21/13
---	------	--	-------------------------

13.1	The Committee <u>received</u> the final 2020/21 internal audit report on Dynamics and E5 Key IT Controls which had been rated ‘significant assurance with minor improvements required’.	
Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/12v	Internal Audit Reports: Students Welfare, Wellbeing and Support	Minute Ref A/4/21/14
14.1	The Committee <u>received</u> the final 2020/21 internal audit report on Student Welfare, Wellbeing and Support which had been rated ‘significant assurance with minor improvements required’. A member asked whether the completion date of 31 July 2022 for all recommendations was soon enough. Louise Bostock, KPMG, noted that the completion date for recommendation 1 appeared to be appropriate given the dependencies on action by other areas. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations agreed that it would be appropriate to revisit proposed completion dates with relevant managers to ensure that they were appropriate.	
Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/12vi	Internal Audit Reports: Leading Change Through Covid-19 and Beyond – New Models of Working	Minute Ref A/4/21/15
15.1	The Committee <u>received</u> the final 2020/21 advisory (therefore not rated) internal audit report on Leading Change Through Covid-19 and Beyond – New Models of Working.	
Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/12vii	Internal Audit Reports: Follow-up	Minute Ref A/4/21/16
16.1	The Committee <u>received</u> KPMG’s report on the results of their follow up review to assess the implementation by the University of recommendations made by internal audit in prior years. It was noted that there had been an increase to 66% of recommendations followed up that had either been implemented, were on track to be implemented within the original deadline set, or had been superseded, compared to 55% in 2019/20. Where recommendations were overdue the majority had revised completion dates agreed by the University Leadership Team. In response to a question it was confirmed that KPMG had not followed-up recommendations with a September 2021 completion date. A member complemented the University team for addressing recommendations.	
Agenda item Paper Ref A/4/21/16	Annual Value for Money Report 2020/21	Minute Ref A/4/21/17
17.1	The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching and Learning, the Dean of Students and the Head of Strategic Insight and Data joined the meeting for the item. The Committee received the annual value for money report 2020/21 which provided assurance to the Committee that the University met the requirements of the OfS Value for Money Strategy 2019 to 2021 and associated guidance. The report also informed the Committee’s duty to satisfy itself that arrangements were in place to promote economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The following was highlighted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the OfS guidance on its Value for Money Strategy 2019 to 2021 set out how Universities should interpret the strategy, focusing on three key areas: teaching quality and outcomes; consumer protection; and fees, funding and efficiency; • in relation to teaching quality and outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ retention rates had improved significantly in 2020/21, rising from 91% to 94%. This improvement reflected positively on the steps taken by the University to assist students whose first year of study coincided with the first 6 six months of the Covid-19 pandemic; ○ performance in relation to highly skilled employment/graduate outcomes had dropped, however, the survey had been conducted during the covid-19 pandemic. Full survey data, which would allow the University to compare its performance against the sector, was yet to be released; ○ good honours rates had increased and the awarding rate for BAME students had narrowed; 	

- in relation to the National Student Survey (NSS) the satisfaction scores at the University and across the sector in 2020/21 had been affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. Overall satisfaction scores at the University had fallen from 82% to 71%, with satisfaction with Teaching and Learning falling from 85% to 77%. It was noted that the Board of Governors would be considering the NSS at the October 2021 strategy event including action to address the issues raised by the pandemic and underlying systemic issues (some of which were University-specific and some of which were sector-wide matters);
- in relation to support for students during the pandemic it was noted that the University had been agile on its response putting in place measures such as laptop loans and hardship funds. The University had put in place fair outcome measures which both supported students and secured the value of the University's qualifications.

Agenda item 22
Paper Ref
A/4/21/22

**Deadlines and Requirements for 2021/2022 Data
Returns and Annual Financial Return 2022**

Minute Ref
A/4/21/18

- 18.1 The Chief Finance and Planning Officer reported that the OfS was carrying out a review of TRAC in conjunction with UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) and the other UK funding bodies. The focus of the review, which was due to report in autumn 2021, was on reducing burden whilst continuing to ensure the effectiveness of the TRAC system. As part of the review process, the OfS and partners had agreed to the early adoption of a change that would help in reducing administrative burden for providers required to submit a TRAC return. While accountable officers would remain responsible for signing off the TRAC return before submission, the OfS was removing the requirement for a committee of the Board of Governors to confirm compliance with the TRAC requirements and approve the TRAC return. At Sheffield Hallam this approval had previously been provided by the Audit and Risk Committee. The deadline for submitting TRAC for 2020-21 was 31 March 2022. The University's TRAC return would continue to be submitted to the Audit and Risk Committee for information.

Agenda item 14
Paper Ref
A/4/21/14

**Draft KPMG Annual Report to the Vice Chancellor
and the Board of Governors 2020/2021**

Minute Ref
A/4/21/19

- 19.1 The Committee received KPMG's draft annual report 2020/21 and noted that the report would be further revised and updated for submission to the November 2021 meeting. It was noted that three reports from the 2020/21 programme remained outstanding and that KPMG did not anticipate any issues arising from these reviews which would affect their annual opinion.

Agenda Item 15
Paper Ref
A/4/21/15

**Draft Internal Audit Strategy and Operational Plan
2021/2022**

Minute Ref
A/4/21/20

- 20.1 The Committee noted that a discussion on an outline programme had taken place at its May 2021 meeting. It was noted that flexibility in the programme continued to be important and KPMG would keep the plan under review with management.

- 20.2 It was noted that at the May 2021 meeting the Committee had agreed to defer the staff appraisal review of 2021/22 (A/3/21/10.3 refers). In addition, the Committee had also noted that the Chair had agreed to defer the TESOF audit to 2021/22 (A/3/21/10.1). These two audits had been included in draft internal audit and strategy document for review in 2022/23. It was noted that:

- staff appraisal had been further deferred because work was ongoing to implement a Learner Management System and HROD had advised that it would not be timely to audit staff appraisals in 2021/22. It was agreed that the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations would discuss with the Chief People Officer whether an audit of staff appraisal should take place in 2021/22 as Committee members observed that there was a gap in terms of coverage of human resources systems in the plan and it might be helpful for an audit to advise on the implementation of the system for staff appraisals and consider

culture and practice around staff appraisals. Other HR areas suggested for review were workforce planning, culture and values, and diversity and inclusion – it was noted that an internal report on academic workforce planning was due to be submitted to the November 2021 meeting;

- the TESOF audit had been scheduled for 2022/23 as it would not be timely to audit in 2021/22 because the Government’s decision on implementation of the recommendations made by the Independent Review of the Teaching Excellence and Students Outcomes Framework was awaited, meaning that this would not be any meaningful area to audit in 2021/22.

20.3 It was noted that there were a number of areas which were categorised as high (red) risk in the corporate risk register which were not being addressed in internal audits during 2021/22. It was agreed that KPMG should add an additional column into the table showing corporate risks to show when the risk area had last been subject to internal audit and the specific area audited.

20.4 The Committee approved the 2021/22 internal audit programme, subject to further discussions with the Chief People Officer in relation to HR focused audits.

Agenda Item 17
Paper Ref
A/4/21/17

**Audit and Risk Committee Annual Effectiveness
Review**

Minute Ref
A/4/21/21

21.1 The Committee received a report on the effectiveness of the Audit and Risk Committee during 2020/21. The University Secretary highlighted that attendance and engagement during 2020/21 had been good. Recommended actions were:

- continued focus on reducing the length of Committee papers and presentations to allow more time for discussion; and
- continue to provide internal audit reports issued between meetings as they are issued rather than waiting for the issue of the meeting book.

The Committee was assured of the Committee’s compliance with the primary elements of the CUC Code of Governance and that it had discharged its responsibilities under its terms of reference. An annual report of the Committee, which considered the work of the Committee in relation to the financial year 2020/21, would be presented to the joint meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) and the Finance and Employment Committee (FEC) in January 2022 and then to the Board of Governors in February 2022. This report would include the Committee’s opinions as required by its terms of reference and would inform the Board’s consideration of the Annual Report and Financial Statements

21.2 The Committee recommended the change to the quorum of the Committee to the Board of Governors. The new quorum would be 3 of which at least 2 must be independent members of the Board. This change was needed to comply with B4.2 of the revised Regulations (minute BG/3/21/16 refers) which stated that “The quorum of meetings of a committee shall be determined by the Board, but should not generally be less than a 1/3 of the membership, with a majority of Independent Members”.

Agenda item 24

Any Urgent Business

Minute Ref
A/4/21/22

22.1 The University Secretary reported that the University had notified the Office for Students of a reportable event. In line with the agreed process this matter has also been reported to the external and internal auditors, the Chair of the Board of Governors and the Chair of Audit and Risk Committee. The event reported was the withdrawal of offers to three students who had been made offers to study a part-time postgraduate course. The course was not offered as it was unable to reach student experience and financial viability thresholds and therefore it would not have been in the interests of the applicant/institution to run these cohorts in the current year. Following review by the OfS of the information submitted they confirmed that they had no further queries about the event and that they had closed the case.

Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/19	Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures 2020/2021	Minute Ref A/4/21/23
23.1 The Committee <u>noted</u> the report.		
Agenda item Paper Ref A/4/21/20	Report on Waivers of the Financial Regulations	Minute Ref A/4/21/24
24.1 The Committee <u>noted</u> the report. A member noted that very few waivers were not accepted and reasons given for acceptance included that there were no direct competitors or frameworks to use. Were there any action points arising from waivers to reduce the need for further waivers, for example, did the need for a waiver lead to identifying that more suppliers were needed in a particular area? It was <u>agreed</u> to seek feedback from Finance.		
Agenda Item Paper Ref A/4/21/21	Additional Work Carried Out by the External Auditors	Minute Ref A/4/21/25
25.1 The Committee <u>noted</u> the report.		
Agenda item Paper Ref A/4/21/23	Audit and Risk Committee: Annual Business Cycle – to July 2022	Minute Ref A/4/21/26
26.1 The Committee <u>noted</u> the business cycle to July 2022.		
Agenda item 18	Private Meeting of Committee Members and Management	Minute Ref A/4/21/27
27.1 Representatives from the external and internal auditors left the meeting. Members of the Committee met privately with management (i.e. the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations and the Chief Finance and Planning Officer).		
27.2 A minute confidential to the Committee was recorded.		
Agenda Item 25	Date of Next Meeting	Minute Ref A/4/21/28
28.1 Thursday 25 November 2021, 1600 to 1830		