

INTRODUCTION

The 2024-25 ILS evaluation process included vendor demonstrations as well as in-person and virtual visits to libraries currently using reviewed software products. Both Polaris and SirsiDynix have some positive Serials attributes, including issue-level holds for patrons, better claiming functionality, the ability to un-receive issues, many canned reports and reporting abilities, fast response time on bibs with many items, and the ability for libraries to combine issues and add unexpected supplements on the fly. Both Polaris and SirsiDynix do still have functionality that is only available in their respective clients, but both are focused on putting more and more functionality into their web-based services and are no longer adding new functionality to their clients. In regards to the Serials module, it seems like most functionality only in their clients would mainly be limited to SCLS system administration tasks.

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

[Serials \(ILS Evaluation 2024-25\)](#)

SYSTEM REVIEWS

Polaris

The majority of the vendor demonstrations and site visits featured Polaris Leap.

Pros

- Issue-level holds for patrons, so patrons don't have to choose specific item
- Has claiming functionality that allows users to auto-send to vendor
- Ability to un-receive issues
- Many options for canned reports and reporting abilities, including the option to email results
- Fast response time on bibs with many items
- Ability for libraries to combine issues and add unexpected supplements on the fly
- Extensive vendor documentation and support available
- User Group available
- Issue line is automatically deleted when item is deleted
- List of items on bib records shows 750 items per page
- List of items on bib records includes a search box and "local items" tab

Cons

- Libraries do not share a centralized publication pattern
- Holding summaries do not show gaps in issues
- List of items is paginated

SirsiDynix

The majority of the vendor demonstrations featured BlueCloud and Symphony Web.

Pros

- Issue-level holds for patrons, so patrons don't have to choose specific item
- Has claiming functionality that allows users to auto-send to vendor
- Ability to un-receive issues
- Many options for canned reports and reporting abilities, including the option to email results
- Fast response time on bibs with many items
- Ability for libraries to combine issues and add unexpected supplements on the fly
- Extensive vendor documentation and support available
- User Group available

- Libraries share a centralized publication pattern
- Able to set current issues to be able to be checked out after a set amount of days

Cons

- Libraries would need to delete and re-predict their publication patterns whenever they are changed
- Holding summary needs to be updated separately
- Issue line is not automatically deleted when item is deleted

Bibliovation

We did not have vendor demonstrations or visits for Bibliovation. Assessments are based on our current experience of the software.

Pros

- Libraries share a centralized publication pattern
- Libraries do not need to re-predict their publication patterns whenever they are changed
- Robust publication pattern options

Cons

- Claiming functionality limited, no ability to auto-send to vendor
- Unable to place issue-level holds, patrons must choose specific item
- Clunky workflow for deleting issues
- Response time issues for bibs with many items
- Difficult to generate reports from Serials table data
- Vendor documentation is sparse and support is limited
- No User Group

RECOMMENDATION

The Serials Workgroup has a slight preference for SirsiDynix with Polaris as a close second choice, but either of the two products would work. The Serials Workgroup does not recommend Bibliovation.