

Sandra Glenney and her choice of Psychologists for Loudoun County CPS

In a previous post I mentioned that the psychologists that Sandra Glenney chooses tend to testify to what Sandra Glenney wants. In the case of Dr. Mary Lindahl, she and Sandra Glenney are in total agreement. I have often wondered if it is simply for financial reasons that psychologists testify on behalf of Sandra Glenney or do they really believe what they are saying.

Sandra Glenney has used and thinks very highly of Dr. Joyanna Silberg. As mentioned in a previous post, Ms. Glenney proposed Dr. Silberg for a case in Loudoun County. Dr. Silberg is not the quality professional that Ms. Glenney presents to the Court. Dr. Silberg endorsed the book "22 Faces of Eve" written by Judy Byington. I have located an audio [interview](#) of Ms. Byington. This interview has enlightened me. If the reader listens to the interview, I believe Ms. Byington enters the recording at around the 45 minute mark. The reader will be horrified. One thing is certain, Ms. Byington should not be seeing patients, she needs therapy herself.

It is more concerning that Dr. Silberg endorsed the book "22 Faces of Eve" by Judy Byington. Dr. Silberg has a [website](#) that describes her beliefs. Her beliefs are very concerning. Sandra Glenney has high praises for Dr. Silberg, which is also concerning. Dr. Silberg also testifies quite often, around the country, in sexual abuse trials. She always testifies that abuse has happened. One only needs to listen to the interview with Ms. Byington to realize that no professional psychologist should be endorsing her book.

If a defendant or their attorney is involved in a case in which Sandra Glenney proposes to use Dr. Silberg as a therapist in the case, it is important to oppose this vehemently. The following is an excerpt from judicial [opinion](#) on New Jersey. It is important to read this, it illustrates that some psychologists are going to find abuse regardless of the facts. Secondly, they will keep interviewing the child until the child tells them what they want to hear. If you read the opinion in its entirety you will see that Dr. Silberg's testimony is shaky at best.

Sandra Glenney however holds Dr. Silberg in very high regard.

*Dr. Silberg testified she went into the interview "completely cold" because she did not want to have any possible biases that could come with knowing the allegations. However, she admitted having spoken with mother's attorney before conducting the interview, who informed her of the "urgency" in interviewing the children and issuing a report because father was seeking parenting time and her report was being used in support of mother's opposition to that request. The psychologist also admitted that prior to the interview, mother had spoken to her for about twenty minutes about her sexual problems with father and that mother had told her it was consistent with what he did to the children. **Dr. Silberg also reviewed a "symptom checklist" to corroborate sexual abuse. She admitted, however, that mother, not M.M., responded to the checklist, but explained that factor was built into the instrument.** Dr. Silberg related that she evaluated whether M.M.'s memory was tainted based on her conversations with M.M. and her mother and the behavioral checklist.*

Dr. Silberg did not videotape the evaluation of M.M. but used an audio recorder that shut

off multiple times. She claimed she took “accurate verbatim notes” in order to fill in the gaps in the tape recording, but conceded she did not write down everything that was said. **She also testified the only information she needed “to make conclusive results and opinions” was the interview with the child.**

Dr. Silberg acknowledged when she first interviewed M.M. in July 2006, she was “aware that there was a question about the validity of [M.M.’s] previous reports” and they “may have been suspect.” Nonetheless, she opined that M.M. was not coerced because of the consistency of her answers. In addition to M.M.’s verbal answers, Dr. Silberg testified she assessed M.M.’s body language to determine if it was consistent with what she was saying. According to the psychologist, M.M. “held her crotch” and gagged when reporting the incidents of abuse, which Dr. Silberg claimed demonstrated the reports were the product of real memories. Furthermore, the psychologist opined that M.M.’s facial expressions and demeanor when discussing the abuse indicated her statements were reliable.

Dr. Silberg also said she was told by mother how many times M.M. had been interviewed. She was confident, based on M.M.’s behavior and the time that had elapsed since earlier interviews, that those interviews had not tainted M.M.’s disclosures.