









collaborative instruction, he presented with a 66% increase in his ability to identify and produce rhyming words.

On the other hand, it is important to discuss the results of RE. During the evaluation of rhyming and segmenting skills prior to the iPad-based collaborative approach, RE demonstrated significant difficulty with rhyming and emerging skills with segmenting. Further, after exposure to the iPad-based collaborative approach, RE demonstrated a slight regression in rhyming and segmenting skills. However, he did demonstrate an increase in his blending ability resulting in a change from emerging to mastery skills. Based on reports from the dyad who provided instruction for RE, he demonstrated most difficulties when the directions necessary to retain the task appeared to be complex. This may indicate that RE was unable to attend to the task when the wording or presentation of how to complete the task was perceived to be high level. In addition, the findings may also adhere to the fact that RE presented with lack of motivation to complete instruction. The dyad reported that RE seemed to lose motivation and focus after 10 minutes of instruction that was too difficult. Despite, the findings of RE's results, it appears that his regression in skill was possibly due to comprehension and motivation rather than a result of the iPad-based collaborative instruction. Results from the analysis of the students' scores before and after the iPad-based collaborative instruction suggests, that training of the this instruction provided professionals with the ability to confidently collaborate, plan, implement, and assess the reading skills of children at risk for reading delays.

Ultimately, the researchers have arrived at the conclusion in this study that the iPad-based collaborative approach is a legitimate approach to addressing reading skills in students' who may be at risk or delayed. As the availability of resources becomes more limited for educators, this approach may prove to be an effective way to address the needs of students' who are at risk or experiencing reading delays without placing a financial burden on the school setting.

This study positively contributes to literature on collaboration in educational settings [9]. It provides evidence that when teachers and SLPs work as a collaborative team, benefits to the students' academic success can be achieved. It is recommended that collaboration amongst education professionals include meaningful and intensive training on how to collaborate, plan, implement instruction and intervention, interpret student assessment data and effectively share expertise to support at-risk or delayed readers. It is also recommended that the use of iPad-based instruction be encouraged in the teaching and intervention of reading skills for school-age children. Evaluating the

effectiveness of these opportunities to use methods like the one applied in this study can offer possibilities to teachers and related providers of ways to enhance the production and approach of their own professional practices [9].

## 6. References

- [1] National Reading Panel . (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read: In evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* . Washington, DC : National Institute of Child Health and Human Development .
- [2] Practices, National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English/Language Arts*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- [3] Idol, L., Paolucci-Whitcomb, p., & Nevin, A. (1986). *Collaborative consultation*. Rockville, MD : Aspen.
- [4] ASHA Committee on Language Learning Disorders. (1990). *A model for collaborative service delivery for students with language-learning disorders in the public schools* . Rockville, MD: ASHA.
- [5] Ehren, B. J. (2011, December 1). SLPs Teachers Partners Implementing Common Core Standards. Orlando, Florida.
- [6] Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2007). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals, 5th ed.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc .
- [7] Carlson, E., Brauen, M., Klein, S., Scholl, K., & Willig, S. (2002). *Study of personnel needs in special education: Key findings*. Rockville, MD: Westat.
- [8] Engen, L., & Hoen, T. (2002). Phonological skills and reading comprehension . *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15, 613-631.
- [9] Griffin, C. C., Jones, H. A., & Kilgore, K. L. (2006). A qualitative study of student teachers' experience with collaborative problem solving . *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 29 , 44-55.