Dear Sir/Madam

I have been therapeutically qualified since 1983 and have been involved in eye disease diagnosis and management since graduating. I initially worked in a multi-disciplinary medical centre for 8 years where I advised the GP on diagnosis and treatment of many and varied ocular conditions, including inflammations of the eye.

Despite my strong interest in eye disease since graduating, I believe that I would not have completed the therapeutics course if the law was to have changed only now. This is not to say that I intend to stop working in the near future. However, there are priorities in one's life and I believe that optoms should have the right to continue working in their profession without being forced to become therapeutically qualified.

As for new entrants, I can't see why they should be treated differently to local optoms wanting to gain first-time registration.

As an aside, I believe the current ruling that necessitates therapeutically endorsed optometrists to have half of the mandatory 40 CPD points derived from courses dealing with therapeutic drugs, severely affects the direction of the profession. I believe that most people would consider optometry to be mainly about caring for functional vision problems, having due regard for ocular disease. If there were no other profession devoted to eye disease, then the current ruling would be acceptable. However, as there is the profession of ophthalmology that is weighted more towards disease and less towards functional vision problems, we cannot afford to lose the domain in which we claim to be the experts, and double-up with ophthalmology in the area of disease. I therefore propose that the ruling be changed so that therapeutically-trained optometrists are not obliged to undertake more than 10 hours of CPD courses dealing with therapeutic drugs.

Yours Sincerely

Kon Zagoritis

Melbourne