

Union County Public Schools-Visually Impaired Program Functional Vision Assessment

Student Name: Matthew Wulf
Evaluator: Sara Wells, TVI
School: Weddington Middle
Parent/Guardian: Joyce Wulf

Date of Birth: 12/03/1997
Date of Evaluation: 08/03/2009
Grade: 6th
Parent/Guardian Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Eye Doctor: Dr. Erin Goshorn -CEENTA Date of Eye Report: 05/20/09 & 10/29/09
Eye Condition: Constant exotropia, excessive hyperopia. Bilateral Optic Atrophy and rod/cone dystrophy associated with Infantile Refsum's Syndrome
Doctor Reported Acuity: 20/100-20/200 range (May 2009 distance acuity- 5/20 -1) delayed alert behavior
Doctor Reported Fields: Not noted (Dec. 2009 full to distraction)
Glasses: For full time wear

Background Information:

Matthew is followed by Dr. Martinez in Spain who specializes in Matthew's adrenal condition. Matthew experiences seizures. He was home schooled last year with the A BEKA program. It contains instruction on video. In the past, mom has reported that he sits about 2-3 feet from the TV when watching it and attends well to his computer and Vanguard. In fourth grade, he received textbooks on CD, which mom reported Matthew loved and worked well for him. In years past, any information presented outside of 5 feet was inaccessible to Matthew because of his vision.

Functional Vision:

A functional vision assessment was completed in the morning with Debra, his sister and Lynn Marentette, school psychologist, present. He was assessed in the familiar work/school space of his home. His sister presented the information to him, with the evaluator's supervision. He was always given 3 or 4 choices with the correct choice in a different spot. He was observed physically touching each choice while visually scanning before grabbing the correct choice. He wore his glasses and was cooperative throughout the entire assessment which lasted about an hour and fifteen minutes.

Pupil response did not appear to dilate or constrict to light, which may indicate sensitivity to light. Matthew blinked to touch on nose, but not before when a visual stimulus was coming towards his eyes. When presented with materials, he would both look and touch them. Visual fields were not tested, but according to doctor are full to distraction. Matthew scanned vertically, horizontally and to the 4 quadrants when presented with choices. He also tracked successfully while moving his head. He needed wait time with occasional physical or auditory prompts as to what he needed to look at. His ideal work situation was with the overhead light off, with a desk light shining on his work material, both for near and distance. He was observed light gazing for self stimulation on the light and ceiling fan.

To assess distance acuity, Matthew was tested at a distance of 10 feet, 8 feet and 5 feet using the Feinbloom Test for the Partially Sighted. The chart was presented at a distance for him to look at and he was then asked to choose the same number off his communication board, when given numbers in a horizontal row. When really focusing at a distance, a right head tilt was observed. At 10 feet, the overhead lights were off with a light shining on the acuity chart to direct his attention at a distance. He successfully identified all numbers up to 10/200. He was unsuccessful on 10/180 and when asked if he could see the chart with his yes/no board, he stated "no". With the overhead lights on at 10 feet, he was successful at identifying up to 10/350. With the overhead lights on at 8 feet, Matthew was not successful at identifying any numbers. At 5 feet, with the overhead lights on, Matthew was successful up to 10/200.

To assess near acuity, the Lighthouse Continuous Reading Cards (LCRC) were used. His sister would ask him to read the large print sentence she presented to him and then ask him to choose the same sentence from a vertical choice of 4. The choices were different sentences in different size fonts, according to the LCRC. The lights were off and a desk light was shined on his work. He was observed using a working distance of 16 inches. He was observed to track each sentence and scan each choice. He was successful up to the 20/200 line. Once he started making mistakes after the 20/200 line, we asked him if he could see the sentence and he responded "no" on his yes-no board. The 20/200 line is approximately 33 point font. When we brought the board closer than 16 inches to see if that would help and got the same results.

Recommendations:

- Glasses at all times
- Minimize Glare
- High contrast materials with well lit background to reduce clutter
- Large print materials 33 point, but responds to 22-24 point font during home instruction
- Wait time to attend to and process visual information
- Preferential seating, information no further than 5 feet for instruction
- Pair visual information with auditory and tactile information for support
- Textbooks on CD