Supreme Court abortion decision resonates for Missouri, Kansas
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A momentous Supreme Court ruling on Monday struck down provisions in a Texas abortion law that justices said imposed unconstitutional burdens on women seeking to end their pregnancy.

The decision clearly said legislative efforts that purport to protect the health of women seeking abortions can create an undue burden or obstacle that deprives them of their rights.

“Neither of these provisions offers medical benefits sufficient to justify the burdens upon access that each imposes,” Justice Stephen Breyer wrote in the majority opinion. “Each places a substantial obstacle in the path of women seeking (an) abortion, each constitutes an undue burden on abortion access, and each violates the federal Constitution.”

The 5-3 ruling will have implications beyond Texas, including in Missouri and Kansas, both of which have similar abortion restrictions. One, in Missouri, resulted in the closing of a medical abortion clinic in Columbia. Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri is scrutinizing the decision and will determine in coming days how to proceed. Kansans for Life is watching preparations for a case pending in Shawnee County District Court.

One thing both sides agree on: The Supreme Court ruling handed down Monday was consequential.

“This is easily the most important decision about reproductive health access in more than 20 years,” said Laura McQuade, president and CEO of Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri. “It is an emotional day.”

“It’s a horrible ruling,” said Kathy Ostrowski, legislative director of Kansans for Life. “The court is twisting its own rules like a pretzel.”

The court struck down two provisions of the Texas law that, a majority of the justices said, imposed unconstitutional restrictions on women’s access to abortion.
Specifically, the law required abortion clinics to meet the same standards as ambulatory surgical centers, including minimum square footage and rules covering plumbing, heating, lighting and ventilation.

The other provision required doctors performing abortions to have admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles.

Advocates of the provisions said they were necessary to protect women’s health. Opponents argued they were part of a pattern meant to make it more difficult for women to get access to abortion services.

Abortion opponents say that goes against court rulings that the states can regulate abortion to make it safe.

“Anyone who professes to care about women who celebrates today’s ruling as a victory is a hypocrite,” said Mary Kay Culp, executive director of Kansans for Life. “They care more about abortion itself and making it available at any cost rather than how it affects the woman, much less the unborn child.”

Missouri Right to Life issued a statement saying it was “profoundly disappointed” by the court’s ruling.

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a statement saying the court “has rejected a common-sense law protecting women from abortion facilities that put profit above patient safety.”

Other groups, including the National Organization for Women, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Feminist Majority and the National Abortion Federation, praised the ruling.

“By striking down the admitting privileges requirement and the surgical center construction mandate, the decision in Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt (the Texas case) helps expose TRAP laws for what they are: medically unnecessary regulations designed to be so burdensome that abortion clinics will be forced to close,” the National Organization for Women said in a statement.

TRAP is a term used by abortion rights advocates to refer to “targeted regulation of abortion providers.”

A 2005 Missouri law requires that abortion facilities meet ambulatory surgical center standards and that physicians providing abortion services have admitting privileges at a nearby hospital.
“We are currently looking at all avenues to invalidate those two restrictions in the state of Missouri,” McQuade said in a conference call with reporters.

Republicans in the Missouri Senate said the state should fight any attempt to do that.

Sen. Kurt Schaefer, a Columbia Republican, said that “it is important that the governor and attorney general ... do all that is within their power to defend Missouri’s law requiring doctors to have clinical privileges at local hospitals in case a patient requires emergency treatment.”

The St. Louis-area Planned Parenthood clinic is the only facility in Missouri currently offering surgical abortion services. It meets the ambulatory surgical standard and has admitting privileges.

**The Planned Parenthood clinic in Columbia, which provided nonsurgical abortions, became a battleground last year when the University of Missouri, under political pressure from Republican lawmakers, decided to revoke admitting privileges to its hospital for the clinic’s physician. That put the clinic’s license in jeopardy.**

The clinic stopped providing abortion services in November, but a federal judge temporarily stopped the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services from revoking the clinic’s license. The Columbia Daily Tribune reports that the license is due to expire Thursday.

McQuade said the physician has a review hearing July 15 with the University of Missouri Hospital.

In Kansas, provisions similar to the ones in Texas were enjoined by a state court in 2011 and are not currently in effect. There are two abortion providers in Overland Park, Planned Parenthood and the Center for Women’s Health. The South Wind Women’s Center in Wichita provides abortion services. The Planned Parenthood clinic in Wichita provides medication but does not perform surgical abortions.

Gov. Sam Brownback’s office issued a statement saying, “We are disappointed in the Supreme Court’s ruling, but the governor will continue the fight to make Kansas a pro-life state.”


“That decision exemplifies the court’s troubling tendency to bend the rules when any effort to limit abortion, or even to speak in opposition to abortion, is at issue,” Thomas wrote.
The Texas case pitted Whole Woman’s Health against the commissioner of the Texas Department of State Health Services. The state’s solicitor general said in his court brief the provisions of the law were intended to provide abortion patients with “the highest standard of health care.” Several states, including Kansas, supported Texas.

The clinic said the restrictions “would close more than 75 percent of abortion facilities and deter new ones from opening.”

The Supreme Court ruling does not sweep away other restrictions many states have enacted involving abortion.

In Kansas, a measure banning a second-trimester abortion method is also under injunction and pending before the Kansas Supreme Court. A separate measure banning taxpayer funding for abortions is in effect but is being challenged, Ostrowski of Kansans for Life said. In all cases, the state attorney general’s office is defending the legislation.

McQuade said the Supreme Court ruling, while welcome, does not signal the end of this part of the abortion battle.

“We do not expect this decision to lessen the vehemence of our opponents to continue to pass unconstitutional legislation,” she said. “We do not expect the backlash to stop, of course, but we believe we are on firmer constitutional grounds this morning than we were yesterday morning.”

Supreme Court overturns Texas abortion laws that mirror Missouri restrictions
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Abortions will resume in Columbia as soon as a U.S. Supreme Court decision Monday striking down a Texas abortion law can be applied to Missouri, Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri President and CEO Laura McQuade said.
Speaking hours after the ruling, McQuade said attorneys still were pouring over the ruling to determine what legal steps need to be taken. Within a few days, she said, they will know if they need to take court action or if the ruling itself will be enough to bar enforcement of Missouri laws.

Once the laws are not in effect, she said, services in Columbia “will be immediately reinstated ... and we will look at all other options across the state,” McQuade said.

In a 5-3 decision, Justice Stephen Breyer wrote that states could not require doctors at abortion clinics to have admitting privileges or for clinics to meet construction and staffing standards for ambulatory surgical centers.

“Both the admitting privileges and surgical center requirements place a substantial obstacle in the path of women seeking a previability abortion, constitute an undue burden on abortion access and thus violate the Constitution,” Breyer wrote.

The Texas law does not advance the publicly stated objectives of protecting women who suffer complications from an abortion or to protect against other health risks, Breyer wrote.

“The record makes clear that the surgical-center requirement provides no benefit when complications arise in the context of an abortion produced through medication,” Breyer wrote. “That is because, in such a case, complications would almost always arise only after the patient has left the facility.”

Breyer was joined in the majority by Justices Anthony Kennedy, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan. Justice Samuel Alito wrote a dissent that was joined by Chief Justice John Roberts and Justice Clarence Thomas.

The ruling is one of the most significant Supreme Court decisions in an abortion case in years. In his dissent, Alito argued the court should not have taken the case and, to get the outcome the majority wanted, “simply disregards basic rules that apply in all other cases.”

Under Missouri law, a doctor performing five or more first-trimester abortions in a month must do so in a facility that meets physical guidelines and licensing requirements for ambulatory surgical centers. The doctor must have admitting privileges in a hospital within the community.

Those requirements, in place since 2007, have closed most abortion clinics in Missouri. Since 2012, abortions have been available in Columbia for only four months last year, when physician Colleen McNicholas of St. Louis obtained hospital privileges from University of Missouri Health Care. The privileges were withdrawn when MU stopped offering “refer and follow” privileges under pressure from Republican state lawmakers.

MU Health officials have said the decision to end the privileges was not political.

In an interview Monday morning, McNicholas said she does not believe she will be able to obtain privileges at MU or at Boone Hospital Center because of rules requiring her to regularly
admit patients for care. Without moving her entire practice to Columbia, she said she would not qualify.

The ruling, she said, “is a real victory for science and medicine. The justices really used evidence and studies and what was the risk of abortion, throughout the opinion, to show that the proposed assumption, that this kind of regulation is required to protect women’s health, is wrong.”

The Columbia clinic’s license is set to expire Thursday. After MU Health withdrew privileges for McNicholas, the Department of Health and Senior Services attempted to revoke the clinic’s license. Planned Parenthood successfully sued to block the revocation, but the ruling by U.S. District Judge Nanette Laughrey stood only until the license expires.

The department did not respond to messages seeking information about plans for enforcing Missouri law in light of the ruling. Sam Lee, head of anti-abortion group Campaign Life Missouri, said the department should continue to enforce the laws until ordered not to do so by a court.

The decision, Lee said, “is very disappointing. I think it is going to make it harder for states to pass common-sense health and safety regulations like Texas has done and like Missouri has done previously.”

**MISSOURIAN**

**Supreme Court abortion ruling could impact similar Missouri laws**

ANNA MAPLES, 12 hrs ago

COLUMBIA — There hasn't been a sweeping U.S. Supreme Court decision like this on abortion in 20 years, said Kristin Metcalf-Wilson, the lead nurse practitioner for Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri.

Columbia supporters of Planned Parenthood and abortion rights celebrated Monday after the Supreme Court struck down a Texas law requiring abortion providers to have admitting, or "refer and follow," privileges and meet the requirements of ambulatory surgery centers.

In a 5-3 vote, the Supreme Court ruled that the Texas law is an unconstitutional impediment to a woman's right to have an abortion and had nothing to do with protecting women’s health.
"This really dramatically reaffirmed a woman's right to choose," said Gretchen Maune, an organizer for National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League Pro-Choice Missouri.

"It shows that the Supreme Court won't stand for legislatures doing things to prevent people from having access to safe and legal abortion."

Missouri has a similar law restricting doctors without these privileges from providing abortions. Refer and follow privileges allow doctors to refer patients to hospitals and to monitor their progress but do not allow them to treat patients or prescribe medicine at that hospital.

Republicans from the Missouri Senate criticized the ruling in a news release.

"Today's ruling removes common-sense safeguards and sends the message that the needs of the abortion industry trump the needs of young vulnerable girls," Senator Jeanie Riddle said.

Majority Leader Mike Kehoe accused the court of engaging in "judicial activism" and making up rules as it goes along.

Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri celebrated the ruling, calling the laws "unconstitutional, politically motivated restrictions with no medical merit created by anti-choice extremists to block people from accessing abortion services."

"PPKM will now look closely at our local laws and swiftly form a legal plan to work to overturn both restrictions in the state of Missouri and to ensure they never go into effect in Kansas," Laura McQuade, the president and CEO, said in a news release.

Soon after Monday's ruling, lawyers at both the St. Louis and the Mid-Missouri Planned Parenthood clinics began looking at the next step to getting rid of the Missouri laws, but no decisions have been made yet, said Sarah Felts, a Planned Parenthood spokeswoman.

The Planned Parenthood Columbia Health Center has been unable to perform abortions since staff obstetrician and gynecologist Colleen McNicholas' MU Health Care refer and follow privileges expired in November. That happened after the executive committee of the
medical staff at MU Health Care voted unanimously in September to discontinue "refer and follow" privileges altogether. Steve Whitt, chief medical officer of MU Health Care, said at the time that the privileges were "outdated and unnecessary."

That decision resulted in an outcry from Planned Parenthood supporters, who accused MU of bowing to political pressure and called on then-MU Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin, and later Interim Chancellor Hank Foley, to restore McNicholas' privileges.

They were never restored. But if Missouri law changes, it won't matter.

State Sen. Kurt Schaefer, through the Interim Committee on the Sanctity of Life, spent much of the fall applying intense scrutiny to the relationship between MU and Planned Parenthood. That committee formed in July. Between Aug. 21 and Sept. 3, university officials canceled 10 contracts with Planned Parenthood clinics in five cities throughout four states where MU students could complete clinical hours. In three of the cancellation letters, the university stated the contracts had not been used “for quite some time,” according to previous Missourian reporting.

MU Health Care spokeswoman Mary Jenkins said Monday that the staff has not had time to review the ruling. Christian Basi of the MU News Bureau declined to comment.
Abortion laws under scrutiny, mid-Missourians sound off

COLUMBIA - The Supreme Court of the United States voted against Texas’s anti-abortion laws, Monday morning. A five to three vote in Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt now has many other states questioning how this will affect similar laws.

Laura McQuade, the Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri President and CEO, said this ruling directly affects mid-Missouri.

“On December 1, the University of Missouri withdrew admitting privileges for our local Planned Parenthood, making it harder to get access for reproductive health. This decision will now drastically impact access to service and the ability to provide access to service,” McQuade said.

According to McQuade, the laws deemed unconstitutional in Texas have been in place in Missouri since 2007.

The SCOTUS decision ruled it was unconstitutional for clinics where abortions are performed to meet the same standards as outpatient surgical centers and for doctors performing the procedures to be required to have admitting privileges to a nearby hospital.

Sen. Kurt Schaefer (R-Columbia) is running for Attorney General in the upcoming statewide elections. He is known for targeting abortion clinics and fighting against abortion laws. Schaefer said the new ruling is unsafe.

"Sadly, the Supreme Court ignored the health and well-being of women. Abortion clinics and those administering abortions should have to meet the same health and safety requirements as other outpatient facilities that perform invasive medical procedures. Anything else is just not safe," Schaefer wrote in a statement.

Associate Dean of the University of Missouri Law School Paul Litton said research studied by the Supreme Court conflicts with Schaefer's comments.
"Based on what I have read and studied based on today's decision, it appears that women's health was more at risk under these potential laws, than without these laws," Litton said.

The Columbia Planned Parenthood celebrated the ruling by hosting an event at Glenn's Café.

Kristin Metcalf-Wilson, the lead nurse practitioner at the Columbia Planned Parenthood, said the two overturned laws were attempts at political moves.

"The restrictions requiring ambulatory surgical centers or admittance privilege for a physician at a local hospital, really provided no improvement of quality care for women's reproductive health and they were strictly a political move or tactic to decrease access to abortion services which are safe and legal in our country," Wilson said.

The Supreme Court's ruling does not change any laws in Missouri, but legal analysts said it could deter similar laws aimed to limit or close abortion clinics.
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AAUP Rethinks How It Fights Governing Boards

When the nation’s leading defender of faculty rights decides to rebuke a college, its precise language may leave close observers scratching their heads. Why, for instance, did it vote this month to sanction the University of Iowa over its controversial presidential search, instead of the board, which it explicitly identified as the bad actor?

The answer: It has long believed it has no other choice.

The American Association of University Professors imposes a penalty known as "sanction" against colleges for violations of shared governance, but its bylaws preclude it from directing sanctions at governing boards, no matter how responsible they might be. It imposes a separate category of penalty, "censure," for violations of tenure or academic freedom. With censures it has the option of directing the rebuke at the board, but it almost always opts to censure the college itself if administrators have any culpability.

Experience has taught the association that governing boards will shrug off its warnings and reprimands unless they’re convinced that their actions will cause a college to suffer from being on the AAUP’s lists of censured or sanctioned institutions.

Recent developments, however, have prompted the AAUP to begin reconsidering how it challenges boards.
The weaknesses of its current approach came into focus at its annual meeting here this month. Top officials of the association bemoaned how it is struggling to fight off increasingly common board overreach in colleges’ affairs, and heard faculty leaders at the University of Iowa protest the AAUP’s sanction of that institution for the actions of a statewide governing board.

In response, the AAUP plans to establish a panel to seek new ways for it to exert pressure on colleges. It also will be reconsidering its policy of sanctioning colleges when their boards trample shared governance.

The AAUP historically has directed its criticisms at colleges’ administrations, rather than their boards, because boards “are less connected to the campus,” says Henry F. (Hank) Reichman, chairman of the association’s Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure and a professor emeritus of history at California State University-East Bay. “It is more effective,” he says, “to sanction or censure the campus administration because they are the ones who have more of a long-term interest in trying to get off the list.”

That said, the AAUP’s leaders have acknowledged that its policies might need to be revised, Mr. Reichman says. “We have been around over 100 years,” he says. "We have a certain stodginess to us, but we have lasted over 100 years by changing over time."

**Multiple Battlefronts**

The University of Iowa case represented the toughest test of the limits of AAUP policies confronted at the association’s recent meeting. The AAUP voted to sanction the university based on a finding that the statewide Iowa Board of Regents had disregarded overwhelming faculty opposition in appointing J. Bruce Harreld, a business consultant, as that institution’s new president. The call for the AAUP sanction vote noted that it was "primarily directed against" the state board, which also oversees Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa, but anyone unfamiliar with the controversy surrounding the presidential search would need to do some digging to understand that nuance.

The Iowa case was hardly the only one in which the AAUP’s approach to boards arose as an issue. It censured the University of Missouri at Columbia for the firing of Melissa A. Click, an assistant professor of communication who had aggressively confronted student journalists, even though the AAUP’s own investigation concluded that the Missouri Board of Curators had acted unilaterally in voting to dismiss her. It opted to keep the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign under censure to keep its board under pressure to adopt faculty protections. In censuring the College of Saint Rose over faculty layoffs, the AAUP faulted the private college’s board for asserting too little oversight.

Although they were not the subject of votes at this year’s AAUP meeting, recent clashes between governing boards and faculty leaders at Sweet Briar College, the University of North Carolina, and the University of Wisconsin have helped reinforce the impression that the association and the faculties it represents are having trouble keeping boards in check.
Since the late 1930s, the AAUP’s policies have allowed for its censure of boards that bear all of the blame for violations of academic freedom or tenure. In such cases it includes next to the college’s name on its censure list a reference to the board as being the real target.

The AAUP’s practice of sanctioning institutions for violations of shared governance is much more recent, having been adopted in 1994. Its vote this month to sanction the University of Iowa stands out in terms of the amount of faculty opposition generated.

In an April letter, top officers of the University of Iowa’s Faculty Senate strongly discouraged the AAUP from taking such an action. They defended their university as having "an exemplary tradition of shared governance," and said Mr. Harreld had both expressed and demonstrated a commitment to shared governance since he took office. Their university, they argued, does not deserve a sanction previously reserved for colleges found to have pervasively denied faculty members "any meaningful role in academic governance."

Michael DeCesare, a professor of sociology at Merrimack College and chairman of the AAUP’s Committee on College and University Governance, says that panel discussed whether to call for the sanction of the Iowa Board of Regents alone but dropped the idea because "we all understood that we could not procedurally do that." Having ruled out the possibility of sanctioning the board, he said, "we were unanimous that the institution should be the target."

Christina Bohannan, a professor of law at the University of Iowa and immediate past president of its Faculty Senate, expresses impatience with the idea that the AAUP’s policies gave it no choice but to sanction her institution. "Frankly," she says, "I think it was on them to say the AAUP needs to change its policy on whom it sanctions, or they should have withheld sanction in this case."

"Now that we are on the sanction list," Ms. Bohannan says, "there is nothing we can do about it because we did not cause the problem in the first place."

Hans-Joerg Tiede, a senior program officer in the AAUP’s department of academic freedom, tenure, and governance, says that by sanctioning the University of Iowa, rather than the Iowa Board of Regents, the AAUP leaves itself the option of issuing additional sanctions if the board violates shared governance at other institutions.

Mr. DeCesare says "it is a bit disingenuous to argue that the faculty and administration were entirely blameless" for what happened at the University of Iowa, because administrators and faculty members were on the presidential-search committee and met with Mr. Harreld as a candidate for the job. He argues that sanctioning the board instead of the university would not have "any effect whatsoever" because the board would lack any real incentive to get the sanction lifted.

For its part, the Iowa Board of Regents appears unfazed by the AAUP’s recent actions. In response to the sanction vote, Josh Lehman, a board spokesman, issued a statement saying the
regents had run "a fair search for the president at the University of Iowa." He said the board disagrees with the AAUP’s characterization of the search process and its imposition of sanction, and "does not have any plans to discuss the sanction at a future meeting."

**Editorial: More Challenges Ahead for MU**

Figures released recently by the U.S. Census Bureau estimate Columbia’s population is now 119,109, making it Missouri’s fourth largest city and the fastest growing metropolitan area in the state. Before officials rush out to update figures posted on signs that guard the city’s principal portals, let’s take a timeout for a reality check.

*Since the latest enumeration includes all the college students, factoring MU’s expected decline of some 2,600 students come August would revise our population down to 117,508, barely exceeding the total for Independence, which Columbia managed to overcome for fourth place.* A Pyrrhic victory in the face of all the *sturm und drang* that evolved since last year.

The latest figure about the city’s estimated population and rapid growth may be the last bulletin of great news Columbia is likely to receive for a while. That’s because the legislative winds of support for dear old Mizzou will blow against us when the solons in the state capital reconvene next January; that’s because Kurt Schaefer will no longer preside over the Senate Budget Committee. Senator Schaefer — the man academics and liberals seem to royally despise — will no longer be around to husband generous appropriations to the University of Missouri and the final cap to his career, the $40 million appropriation the senator gained to place the State Historical Society in its new home on Elm Street.

As Schaefer takes his powder for a go as attorney general, maybe governor eventually, a new contingent of hardened legislative hombres will take over the appropriations process, and the needle of their largess compass is likely to swing ’round to the 225-degree mark (a navigator’s way of saying to the southwest). Columbia and Boone County will be impotent for the first time in quite a few years. The worst fear? A sharply reduced appropriation for the University of Missouri next year. Then, maybe some university programs will be starved for funds, leading eventually to their removal to other universities across the state, where they would be restored and touted as a major gain and enhancement.

The real outcome is likely to be less severe for a number of reasons. Legislative support for the University of Missouri as a percentage of the institution’s total needs has been declining for years. Coupled with budget constraints, the constitutional balanced budget requirement, voter
antipathy to taxation, and Missouri’s sluggish financial growth, universities have been forced to hike tuition and increase other fees, apply for grants, and beg their alums for contributions.

As for cherry picking programs at the University of Missouri, we say, “Not so fast, pardner!” Perhaps we here in the area don’t appreciate Old Mizzou like we should. What we take for granted on the Columbia campus of the University of Missouri includes curricula, programs, buildings, laboratories, colleges, schools, the academic and support staff, a teaching hospital, and dozens of other adjuncts too numerous to account for that have been carefully assembled, administered, and husbanded since the institution was founded in 1839.

What worries us are some of the announcements of late about deans either retiring or moving on to positions elsewhere. A dislocation here and there, but hardly unusual. On the other hand, a “brain drain” replicating the departure of several dozen popular professors that began fifty years ago would concern us.

Wouldn’t we love to hear the university’s publicity apparatchiks announce the hiring of a new president? The ideal candidate would be a relatively young, dynamically personable, enthusiastically articulate, and academically qualified individual challenged with the strong desire to get the university moving again. There are many fences to mend, ranging from the tuition-paying customers to the denizens of government, with a lot of folks in between. This is a long-term project, and beginners need not apply.

5 reasons why you’re not losing weight

You do yogalates three times a week and you’ve practically turned kale into a food group, so why aren’t those scales moving down?

You’d think that eating well and burning calories with workouts would be enough to help you shed the kilos, but it might interest you to know that there are actually a lot of sneaky factors that are sabotaging your weight-loss results.

From bad habits to a lack of sleep, we take a look at five sneaky reasons why your weight loss journey might be at a roadblock.

1. You’re not getting enough sleep

A lack of adequate sleep will throw your body into carbohydrate and fat-craving survival mode, meaning that those who feel constantly sleep deprived will crave foods with a high fat, sugar and carb content.
Avoid 2am bedtimes and ensure that you wake up well-rested by simply going to sleep earlier. Netflix will still be there tomorrow!

2. You work a desk job

A study out of the University of Missouri-Columbia found that sitting for hours on end causes the body to cease production of a fat-inhibiting enzyme called lipase.

Standing and stretching for just 1-2 minutes out of every working hour will burn about 59 calories a day, whilst boosting your body’s metabolism by 15%.

*Top tip: Those who bounce their feet subconsciously under their desk burn up to 350 calories a day! If this isn’t you, it might be time to make a new habit.*

3. You don’t drink enough water

We know that experts recommend a glass of water before a meal to suppress appetite and avoid over-eating, but that’s only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the key part H2O plays in weight loss.

Dehydration causes improper function in the kidneys, which causes the body to turn to the liver for support instead. And because the liver has enough to do without this added task, fat consumed can be stored in the body rather than burnt off in exercise.

4. You tap and go

We all know that paying via paypass can sometimes cause you to make impulsive purchases. Whether it’s that pair of shoes you definitely can’t afford, or that tub of indulgent chocolate mousse, there’s an almost ‘monopoly money’ feel about tap and go that overrides your sense of accountability.

Budget better and avoid impulse buys by paying for your groceries with cash.

5. You eat in front of the TV

Eating while distracted can lead to a mindless increase in food intake, which can often up add around 288 extra calories per sitting!

The best way to understand this is to recall the many times you’ve purchased popcorn for a film, only to somehow finish the box before the movie even starts!

Avoid this by setting aside table time for your meals and snacks.