Matt Samson
President & Financial Advisor
Business Phone/Text
402.204.0230
Cell Phone
402.980.5183
Matt.Samson@ilsfinancial.com

Choosing a Financial Advisor

A Practical Framework for Evaluating Advice, Fit, and Decision Quality

Selecting a financial advisor is one of the most consequential financial decisions an individual or family will make. Unlike choosing an investment or financial product, choosing an advisor involves evaluating process, judgment, communication, and incentives—often across many years and changing circumstances.

This paper provides an educational framework to help investors evaluate financial advisors across regulatory structures, compensation models, delivery formats, and human factors that can influence decision quality. It draws on academic research and regulatory guidance, including the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission's Form CRS (Client Relationship Summary) and Regulation Best Interest (Reg BI), to help investors ask informed questions and better interpret the answers.

The purpose of this paper is educational. It is not intended to recommend any particular advisor, firm, or business model, but to clarify considerations that may be relevant when evaluating professional financial advice.

Why Choosing an Advisor Is Different Than Choosing an Investment

Investments can be compared using performance, cost, and risk metrics.

Advisory relationships cannot.

Research consistently shows that long-term financial outcomes are driven less by individual security selection and more by decisions related to taxation, asset location, behavior, and coordination across accounts and time (Bodie & Treussard, 2007; CFA Institute, 2020). These outcomes depend not only on access to information, but on how advice is delivered and how decisions are made.

As a result, selecting a financial advisor is fundamentally a decision about structure and judgment rather than prediction.

Titles, Roles, and Regulatory Frameworks

One source of confusion for investors is the wide range of titles used in financial services. Titles alone do not determine how advice is delivered, how compensation is structured, or what legal obligations apply.

© 2026 ILS Financial, LLC. All rights reserved.
This document may not be reproduced or distributed without permission.
Investment advice offered through ILS Financial LLC, a Nebraska registered investment advisor, registered or notice filed where required.

Financial professionals may operate under different regulatory frameworks depending on the nature of the relationship, including brokerage relationships, advisory relationships, or combinations of both. These frameworks involve different standards of care, disclosure requirements, and compensation arrangements.

Understanding these distinctions is not about ranking professionals, but about understanding how incentives and responsibilities vary depending on the relationship.

Standards of Care and Legal Obligations

Different advisory relationships are governed by different legal standards. Some involve an ongoing fiduciary obligation, while others are subject to best-interest or suitability-based standards that apply at the time a recommendation is made.

Standards of care influence:

- How recommendations are evaluated
- How conflicts of interest are disclosed and managed
- How responsibility and accountability are defined over time

Regulators emphasize that investors should understand which standard applies to their relationship before engaging in an advisory arrangement, rather than after recommendations are made.

Compensation Structures and Incentives

How an advisor is compensated can influence how advice is delivered.

Industry research indicates that investors typically pay for some combination of:

- Financial planning
- Ongoing advice
- Investment implementation

The distinction lies in whether those costs are explicit, embedded, or transaction-based (Kitces, 2022).

Common compensation structures include commission-based compensation, assets-under-management (AUM) fees, flat or retainer fees, and hybrid arrangements. Rather than focusing solely on cost, investors may find it useful to understand how a compensation structure aligns incentives with the scope and complexity of decisions being supported (Cerulli Associates, 2022).

Domain Knowledge and Decision Context

Two advisors may operate under similar regulatory standards and fee structures yet deliver materially different experiences.

© 2026 ILS Financial, LLC. All rights reserved.
This document may not be reproduced or distributed without permission.
Investment advice offered through ILS Financial LLC, a Nebraska registered investment advisor, registered or notice filed where required.

One factor influencing this difference is contextual knowledge. Professionals in specialized careers—such as pilots, military officers, business owners, or executives—often face decision environments shaped by unique compensation structures, benefit systems, career risks, and timing considerations.

Advice that does not account for these contextual factors may be technically accurate while remaining misaligned with real-world decision constraints. Evaluating whether an advisor understands the decision environment, not solely the portfolio, can be a relevant consideration.

Life Stage, Timing, and Decision Complexity

Advice quality cannot be evaluated solely by account balances or net worth.

Households in different life stages face different planning tradeoffs. Accumulation, optimization, and distribution phases involve distinct risks, priorities, and timing considerations—even when asset levels appear similar.

Research suggests that coordinated planning across time, rather than isolated optimization decisions, can improve after-tax and risk-adjusted outcomes without increasing market risk (Dammon et al., 2004; Poterba, 2001).

Communication, Behavior, and Fit

Behavioral finance research demonstrates that financial outcomes are influenced by how decisions are framed, communicated, and reinforced, particularly during periods of uncertainty or stress (Barberis & Thaler, 2003).

Communication style, decision pacing, and tolerance for ambiguity can affect whether advice is understood, followed, and revisited appropriately over time. Evaluating how an advisor communicates may therefore be as relevant as evaluating what is recommended.

How Advice Is Delivered: In-Person, Virtual, and Hybrid Models

The format through which advice is delivered can shape how it is experienced.

Virtual advisory relationships may offer flexibility, efficiency, and consistency, particularly for individuals with demanding schedules or geographic mobility. In-person meetings may provide additional context for complex or emotionally significant decisions where discussion and nuance matter.

Neither format is inherently superior. Many advisory relationships operate using hybrid approaches that combine virtual coordination with in-person discussions at key decision points. Investors may consider whether the delivery structure supports understanding, confidence, and decision-making over time.

Form CRS, Regulation Best Interest, and the Principles They Reflect

Form CRS and Regulation Best Interest apply to specific advisory and brokerage relationships and are required disclosures for SEC-registered investment advisers and broker-dealers. These rules are designed to help retail

© 2026 ILS Financial, LLC. All rights reserved.
This document may not be reproduced or distributed without permission.
Investment advice offered through ILS Financial LLC, a Nebraska registered investment advisor, registered or notice filed where required.

investors understand the nature of their relationship, including services provided, compensation, conflicts of interest, and legal obligations.

Not all financial professionals or firms are subject to the same disclosure requirements. However, the principles reflected in these rules—clarity of services, transparency of compensation, conflict disclosure, and defined responsibility—are relevant considerations when evaluating any advisory relationship.

Key questions prompted by Form CRS include:

- What services are provided, and on what basis?
- How and when fees are charged?
- What conflicts of interest exist?
- What legal obligations apply?

These questions are intended to establish expectations and understanding at the outset of a relationship.

Judgment, Accountability, and Continuity

Financial advice involves more than information delivery. Advisory relationships differ in how decisions are documented, reviewed, and revisited over time.

Investors may consider how assumptions are evaluated, how responsibility is shared, and how changes in circumstances are addressed. These practices can influence consistency and clarity across market cycles and life transitions.

Continuity is also a practical consideration. Firm structure, advisor capacity, and succession planning may affect whether guidance remains consistent as circumstances evolve.

A Practical Framework for Evaluation

When evaluating an advisory relationship, investors may find clarity by considering:

- Does the advisor understand the decision environment involved?
- How are incentives and conflicts disclosed?
- How are complex or irreversible decisions approached?
- Does the communication style support understanding and follow-through?
- Is the structure designed to remain effective over time?

The answers to these questions may provide insight beyond credentials or past performance.

Conclusion

Choosing a financial advisor is ultimately a decision about alignment—between incentives and responsibilities, complexity and expertise, communication and decision needs, and structure and continuity.

© 2026 ILS Financial, LLC. All rights reserved.
This document may not be reproduced or distributed without permission.
Investment advice offered through ILS Financial LLC, a Nebraska registered investment advisor, registered or notice filed where required.

Regulatory tools such as Form CRS and Regulation Best Interest exist to support clarity and understanding. When investors understand how advice is structured and delivered, they are better positioned to evaluate relationships that support informed decision-making over time.

Works Cited

Full bibliographic details for all sources cited in-text are provided below.

Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). *A survey of behavioral finance*. Handbook of the Economics of Finance, 1, 1053–1128. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0102(03)01027-6

Bodie, Z., & Treussard, J. (2007). *Making investment choices as simple as possible, but no simpler*. Financial Analysts Journal, 63(3), 42–47. https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v63.n3.4681

Cerulli Associates. (2022). *U.S. advisor metrics and trends*. Cerulli Research.

CFA Institute. (2020). *The future of trust in the investment profession*. https://www.cfainstitute.org

Dammon, R. M., Spatt, C. S., & Zhang, H. H. (2004). *Optimal asset location and allocation with taxable and tax-deferred investing*. The Journal of Finance, 59(3), 999–1037. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2004.00659.x

Kitces, M. (2022). *How financial advisors really get paid*. Kitces Research. https://www.kitces.com

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2019). *Regulation Best Interest*. https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/2019/34-86031.pdf

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2020). *Form CRS relationship summary; amendments to Form ADV*. https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/2020/34-88375.pdf

---

Compliance Disclosure

This material is for educational purposes only and is not intended as investment, tax, or legal advice. The information contained herein is general in nature and may not apply to your individual circumstances. Past performance is not indicative of future results. Consult with a qualified professional before making financial decisions.

© 2026 ILS Financial, LLC. All rights reserved.
This document may not be reproduced or distributed without permission.
Investment advice offered through ILS Financial LLC, a Nebraska registered investment advisor, registered or notice filed where required.