

MFS INVESTMENT GRADE MUNICIPAL TRUST
Form N-CSR
February 06, 2009
[Table of Contents](#)

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549
FORM N-CSR

CERTIFIED SHAREHOLDER REPORT OF
REGISTERED MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Investment Company Act file number 811-5785

MFS INVESTMENT GRADE MUNICIPAL TRUST

(Exact name of registrant as specified in charter)

500 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

(Address of principal executive offices) (Zip code)

Susan S. Newton

Massachusetts Financial Services Company

500 Boylston Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02116

(Name and address of agents for service)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: (617) 954-5000

Date of fiscal year end: November 30

Date of reporting period: November 30, 2008

Table of Contents

ITEM 1. REPORTS TO STOCKHOLDERS.

Table of Contents

Annual report

MFS® Investment Grade Municipal Trust

11/30/08

CXH-ANN

Table of Contents

MFS® Investment Grade Municipal Trust

<u>LETTER FROM THE CEO</u>	1
<u>PORTFOLIO COMPOSITION</u>	2
<u>MANAGEMENT REVIEW</u>	4
<u>PERFORMANCE SUMMARY</u>	7
<u>INVESTMENT OBJECTIVE, PRINCIPAL INVESTMENT STRATEGIES AND RISKS OF THE FUND</u>	9
<u>PORTFOLIO MANAGERS' PROFILES</u>	11
<u>DIVIDEND REINVESTMENT AND CASH PURCHASE PLAN</u>	12
<u>PORTFOLIO OF INVESTMENTS</u>	13
<u>STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES</u>	30
<u>STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS</u>	31
<u>STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS</u>	32
<u>FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS</u>	33
<u>NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</u>	35
<u>REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM</u>	45
<u>RESULTS OF SHAREHOLDER MEETING</u>	46
<u>TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS</u>	47
<u>BOARD REVIEW OF INVESTMENT ADVISORY AGREEMENT</u>	53
<u>PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND INFORMATION</u>	58
<u>QUARTERLY PORTFOLIO DISCLOSURE</u>	58
<u>FEDERAL TAX INFORMATION</u>	58
<u>MFS® PRIVACY NOTICE</u>	59
<u>CONTACT INFORMATION</u> BACK COVER	

New York Stock Exchange Symbol: CXH

NOT FDIC INSURED MAY LOSE VALUE

NO BANK GUARANTEE

Table of Contents

LETTER FROM THE CEO

Dear Shareholders:

The global economy is not a very welcoming place these days. Headlines tell the story of slowing growth, accelerating inflation, and credit collapse. We have watched the rampant selling that has typified equity and credit markets since the strains in the financial system first became apparent last year.

The volatility in commodity and currency markets has further complicated investment choices. There are so many parts moving in so many directions; it has become very easy to get overwhelmed.

At MFS® we remind investors to keep their eye on the long term and not become panicked by the uncertainty of the day to day.

Remember that what goes down could very easily come back up. And that is where we as money managers like to turn our focus.

Investment opportunities may arise in declining markets. When markets experience substantial selloffs, assets often become undervalued. At MFS, we have a team of global sector analysts located in Boston, London, Mexico City, Singapore, Sydney, and Tokyo working together to do the kind of bottom-up research that will root out these investment opportunities.

In times like these, we encourage our investors to check in with their advisors to ensure they have an investment plan in place that will pay heed to the present, but that is firmly tailored to the future.

Respectfully,

Robert J. Manning

Chief Executive Officer and Chief Investment Officer

MFS Investment Management®

January 15, 2009

The opinions expressed in this letter are subject to change, may not be relied upon for investment advice, and no forecasts can be guaranteed.

Table of Contents

PORTFOLIO COMPOSITION

Portfolio structure

Top five industries (i)

Healthcare Revenue Hospitals	19.6%
Universities Colleges	18.0%
State & Local Agencies	12.4%
Utilities Investor Owned	6.0%
Healthcare Revenue Long-Term Care	5.4%

Credit quality of bonds (r)

AAA	19.3%
AA	17.2%
A	21.7%
BBB	27.0%
BB	2.1%
CCC	0.3%
Not Rated	12.4%

Portfolio structure reflecting equivalent exposure of derivative positions (i)

Portfolio facts

Average Duration (d)(i)	12.3
Average Life (i)(m)	13.9 yrs.
Average Maturity (i)(m)	15.9 yrs.
Average Credit Quality of Rated Securities (long-term) (a)	A+

Table of Contents

Portfolio Composition continued

- (a) The average credit quality of rated securities is based upon a market weighted average of portfolio holdings that are rated by public rating agencies.

 - (d) Duration is a measure of how much a bond's price is likely to fluctuate with general changes in interest rates, e.g., if rates rise 1.00%, a bond with a 5-year duration is likely to lose about 5.00% of its value.

 - (i) For purposes of this presentation, the bond component includes accrued interest amounts and may be positively or negatively impacted by the equivalent exposure from any derivative holdings, if applicable.

 - * The fund holds short treasury futures with equivalent bond exposure of (24.9)% for the purposes of managing the fund's duration.

 - (m) The average maturity shown is calculated using the final stated maturity on the portfolio's holdings without taking into account any holdings which have been pre-refunded or pre-paid to an earlier date or which have a mandatory put date prior to the stated maturity. The average life shown takes into account these earlier dates.

 - (r) Each security is assigned a rating from Moody's Investors Service. If not rated by Moody's, the rating will be that assigned by Standard & Poor's. Likewise, if not assigned a rating by Standard & Poor's, it will be based on the rating assigned by Fitch, Inc. For those portfolios that hold a security which is not rated by any of the three agencies, the security is considered Not Rated. Holdings in U.S. Treasuries and government agency mortgage-backed securities, if any, are included in the AAA-rating category. Percentages are based on the total market value of investments as of 11/30/08.
- From time to time Cash & Other Assets may be negative due to timing of cash receipts and/or equivalent exposure from any derivative holdings.

Percentages are based on net assets, including the value of auction preferred shares, as of 11/30/08, unless otherwise noted.

The portfolio is actively managed and current holdings may be different.

Table of Contents

MANAGEMENT REVIEW

Summary of Results

The MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust (the fund) is a closed-end fund investing primarily in investment-grade municipal debt.

For the twelve months ended November 30, 2008, shares of the MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust provided a total return of 20.30%, at net asset value. This compares with a return of 3.61% for the fund's benchmark, the Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index (formerly the Lehman Brothers Municipal Bond Index).

Market Environment

The U.S. economy and financial markets experienced significant deterioration and extraordinary volatility over the reporting period. U.S. economic growth slowed significantly, despite the short-term bounce from the second quarter fiscal stimulus. Strong domestic headwinds included accelerated deterioration in the housing market, anemic corporate investment, a markedly weaker job market, and a much tighter credit environment. During the second half of the period, a seemingly continuous series of tumultuous financial events hammered markets, including: the distressed sale of failing Bear Stearns to JPMorgan, the conservatorship of Government Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs) Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the bankruptcy of investment bank Lehman Brothers, the Federal Reserve Bank's complex intervention of insurance company American International Group (AIG), the nationalization of several large European banks, the failure of Washington Mutual, and the distressed sale of Wachovia. As a result of this barrage of turbulent news, global equity markets pushed significantly lower and credit markets witnessed the worst dislocation since the beginning of the credit crisis.

While reasonably resilient during the first half of the period, the global economy and financial system increasingly experienced considerable negative spillovers from the U.S. slowdown. Not only did Europe and Japan show obvious signs of economic softening, the more powerful engine of global growth—emerging markets—also began to display weakening dynamics.

During the reporting period, the U.S. Federal Reserve Board cut interest rates aggressively and introduced a multitude of new lending facilities to alleviate ever-tightening credit markets, while the U.S. federal government moved quickly to design and implement a meaningful fiscal stimulus package. Although several other global central banks also cut rates, the dilemma of rising energy and food prices heightened concerns among central bankers that inflationary expectations might become unhinged despite weaker growth. Only late in the reporting period did slowing global growth result in a precipitous decline in commodity prices, which began to ease inflation and inflationary

Table of Contents

Management Review continued

expectations. As inflationary concerns diminished in the face of global deleveraging, and equity and credit markets deteriorated more sharply, a coordinated rate cut marked the beginning of much more aggressive easing by the major global central banks.

The municipal bond market faced an unprecedented amount of challenges over the past 15 months, which led to a broad-based decline in bond prices, an increase in yields, and a significant increase in spreads between higher-rated securities and lower-rated or non-rated securities. Among the factors leading to the decline in prices and the widening of spreads were the downgrading from AAA, by at least one of the major rating agencies, the majority of the monoline bond insurers and the unwinding of leverage by non-traditional participants in the municipal bond market.

During the reporting period, demand for municipal debt decreased. This lack of demand for municipal debt was a primary reason behind the increase in interest rates on longer-dated municipal bonds. In recent years, non-traditional buyers of municipal bonds, such as arbitrageurs and leveraged accounts, became important investors in the municipal markets. These investors, in many instances, became net sellers of municipal debt over the investment period. This selling pressure tipped the balance between supply and demand causing rates to rise on the long end of the curve.

Factors Affecting Performance

The fund's duration (d) positioning held back relative results as interest rates on municipal bonds with maturities beyond seven years generally increased during the reporting period. This rise in municipal bond rates was in contrast to what took place in the U.S. Treasury market, where rates declined across the maturity spectrum. The fund chose to use U.S. Treasury futures as a hedge. The value of our short position in U.S. Treasury futures decreased in value as Treasury prices rallied, thus negatively impacting performance of the fund.

The fund's overweight in BBB rated (s) and below investment grade securities further dampened relative returns as spreads between high grade and high yield municipals widened. (The Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index is composed primarily of higher-grade securities with no bonds rated below BBB).

Security selection and the fund's overweighted positions in the *health care* and *industrial* sectors detracted from relative performance as these holdings underperformed the broad market. A relative overweight in the *housing* sector also held back results over the reporting period.

The fund employs leverage which has been created through the issuance of auction preferred shares. To the extent that investments are purchased through leverage, the fund's net asset value will increase or decrease at a greater rate than a comparable unleveraged fund. Therefore, during the reporting period, the fund's use of leverage further hampered the fund's performance.

Table of Contents

Management Review continued

The fund's underweighted exposure to the *credit enhanced* sector contributed to relative performance as the majority of the bond insurers were downgraded from AAA during the period and insured bonds underperformed the broad market. An overweighted position in the *education* sector also helped.

Respectfully,

Michael Dawson
Portfolio Manager

Geoffrey Schechter
Portfolio Manager

(d) Duration is a measure of how much a bond's price is likely to fluctuate with general changes in interest rates, e.g., if rates rise 1.00%, a bond with a 5-year duration is likely to lose about 5.00% of its value.

(s) Bonds rated BBB, Baa, or higher are considered investment grade; bonds rated BB, Ba, or below are considered non-investment grade. The primary source for bond quality ratings is Moody's Investors Service. If not available, ratings by Standard & Poor's are used, else ratings by Fitch, Inc. For securities which are not rated by any of the three agencies, the security is considered Not Rated.

The views expressed in this report are those of the portfolio managers only through the end of the period of the report as stated on the cover and do not necessarily reflect the views of MFS or any other person in the MFS organization. These views are subject to change at any time based on market or other conditions, and MFS disclaims any responsibility to update such views. These views may not be relied upon as investment advice or an indication of trading intent on behalf of any MFS portfolio. References to specific securities are not recommendations of such securities, and may not be representative of any MFS portfolio's current or future investments.

Table of Contents

PERFORMANCE SUMMARY THROUGH 11/30/08

The following chart represents the fund's historical performance in comparison to its benchmark(s). Investment return and principal value will fluctuate, and shares, when sold, may be worth more or less than their original cost; current performance may be lower or higher than quoted. The performance shown does not reflect the deduction of taxes, if any, that a shareholder would pay on fund distributions or the sale of fund shares.

Price Summary

Year Ended 11/30/08	Date	Price
Net Asset Value	11/30/08	\$7.91
	11/30/07	\$10.56
New York Stock Exchange Price	11/30/08	\$6.35
	2/07/08 (high) (t)	\$10.27
	10/10/08 (low) (t)	\$5.50
	11/30/07	\$9.56

Total Returns vs Benchmark

Year Ended 11/30/08

New York Stock Exchange Price (r)	(29.32)%
Net Asset Value (r)	(20.30)%
Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index (f)	(3.61)%

(f) Source: FactSet Research Systems Inc.

(r) Includes reinvestment of dividends and capital gain distributions.

(t) For the period December 1, 2007 through November 30, 2008.

Benchmark Definition

Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index (formerly known as Lehman Brothers Municipal Bond Index) a market capitalization-weighted index that measures the performance of the tax-exempt bond market.

It is not possible to invest directly in an index.

Notes to Performance Summary

The fund's shares may trade at a discount or premium to net asset value. Shareholders do not have the right to cause the fund to repurchase their shares at net asset value. When fund shares trade at a premium, buyers pay more than the net asset value underlying fund shares, and shares purchased at a premium would receive less than the amount paid for them in the event of the

Table of Contents

Performance Summary continued

fund's liquidation. As a result, the total return that is calculated based on the net asset value and New York Stock Exchange price can be different.

From time to time the fund may receive proceeds from litigation settlements, without which performance would be lower.

In accordance with Section 23(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, the fund hereby gives notice that it may from time to time repurchase common and/or preferred shares of the fund in the open market at the option of the Board of Trustees and on such terms as the Trustees shall determine.

Table of Contents

INVESTMENT OBJECTIVE, PRINCIPAL INVESTMENT STRATEGIES AND RISKS OF THE FUND

Investment Objective

The fund's investment objective is to seek high current income exempt from federal income tax, but may also consider capital appreciation. The fund's objective may be changed without shareholder approval.

Principal Investment Strategies

The fund invests, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its net assets, including assets attributable to preferred shares and borrowings for investment purposes, in tax-exempt bonds and tax-exempt notes. This policy may not be changed without shareholder approval. Tax-exempt bonds and tax-exempt notes are municipal instruments, the interest of which is exempt from federal income tax. Interest from the fund's investments may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax.

MFS normally invests at least 80% of the fund's net assets, including assets attributable to preferred shares and borrowings for investment purposes, in investment grade debt instruments. Investment grade debt instruments are those that are rated at the time of purchase in one of the top four rating categories by Moody's; or if not rated by Moody's, by S&P; or if not rated by Moody's or S&P, by Fitch. If a debt instrument is unrated, MFS may assign a rating which it considers to be equivalent to that of a major credit rating.

MFS may also invest in lower quality debt instruments.

MFS may invest 25% or more of the fund's total assets in municipal instruments that finance similar projects, such as those relating to education, healthcare, housing, utilities, water, or sewers.

MFS may invest a relatively high percentage of the fund's assets in the debt instruments of a single issuer or a small number of issuers.

MFS may use derivatives for different purposes, including to earn income and enhance returns, to increase or decrease exposure to a particular market, to manage or adjust the risk profile of the fund, or as alternatives to direct investments.

MFS uses a bottom-up investment approach in buying and selling investments for the fund. Investments are selected primarily based on fundamental analysis of instruments and their issuers in light of current market, economic, political, and regulatory conditions. Factors considered may include the instrument's credit quality, collateral characteristics, and indenture provisions, and the issuer's management ability, capital structure, leverage, and ability to meet its current obligations. Quantitative analysis of the structure of the instrument and its features may also be considered.

Table of Contents

Investment Objective, Principal Investment Strategies and Risks of the Fund continued

The fund uses leverage through the issuance of preferred shares and/or the creation of tender option bonds, and then investing the proceeds pursuant to its investment strategies. If approved by the fund's Board of Trustees, the fund may use leverage by other methods.

MFS may engage in active and frequent trading in pursuing the fund's principal investment strategies.

In response to market, economic, political, or other conditions, MFS may depart from the fund's principal investment strategies by temporarily investing for defensive purposes.

Principal Risks

The portfolio's yield and share prices change daily based on the credit quality of its investments and changes in interest rates. In general, the value of debt securities will decline when interest rates rise and will increase when interest rates fall. Debt securities with longer maturity dates will generally be subject to greater price fluctuations than those with shorter maturities. Municipal instruments can be volatile and significantly affected by adverse tax or court rulings, legislative or political changes and the financial condition of the issuers and/or insurers of municipal instruments. If the Internal Revenue Service determines an issuer of a municipal security has not complied with applicable tax requirements, interest from the security could become taxable and the security could decline significantly in value. Derivatives can be highly volatile and involve risks in addition to those of the underlying indicator's in whose value the derivative is based. Gains or losses from derivatives can be substantially greater than the derivatives' original cost. Lower quality debt securities involve substantially greater risk of default and their value can decline significantly over time. To the extent that investments are purchased with the proceeds from the issuance of preferred shares, the fund's net asset value will increase or decrease at a greater rate than a comparable unleveraged fund. To the extent that the fund participates in the creation of tender option bonds, it will hold more concentrated positions in individual securities and so its performance may be more volatile than the performance of more diversified funds. A tender option bond issue may terminate upon the occurrence of certain enumerated events, which would result in a reduction to the fund's leverage. In connection with the creation of tender option bonds and for other investment purposes, the fund may invest in inverse floating rate instruments, whose potential income return is inversely related to changes in a floating interest rate. Inverse floating rate instruments may provide investment leverage and be more volatile than other debt instruments. When you sell your shares, they may be worth more or less than the amount you paid for them. Please see the fund's registration statement for further information regarding these and other risk considerations. A copy of the fund's registration statement on Form N-2 is available on the EDGAR database on the Securities and Exchange Commission's Internet Web site at <http://sec.gov>.

Table of Contents

PORTFOLIO MANAGERS PROFILES

Michael Dawson	Investment Officer of MFS; employed in the investment area of MFS since 1998. Portfolio Manager of the fund since June 2007.
Geoffrey Schechter	Investment Officer of MFS; employed in the investment area of MFS since 1993. Portfolio Manager of the fund since June 2007.

Table of Contents

DIVIDEND REINVESTMENT AND CASH PURCHASE PLAN

The fund offers a Dividend Reinvestment and Cash Purchase Plan (the Plan) that allows common shareholders to reinvest either all of the distributions paid by the fund or only the long-term capital gains. Purchases are made at the market price unless that price exceeds the net asset value (the shares are trading at a premium). If the shares are trading at a premium, purchases will be made at a discounted price of either the net asset value or 95% of the market price, whichever is greater. Four times each year you can also buy shares. Investments may be made in any amount of \$100 or more in January, April, July and October on the 15th of the month or shortly thereafter.

If shares are registered in your own name, new shareholders will automatically participate in the Plan, unless you have indicated that you do not wish to participate. If your shares are in the name of a brokerage firm, bank, or other nominee, you can ask the firm or nominee to participate in the Plan on your behalf. If the nominee does not offer the Plan, you may wish to request that your shares be re-registered in your own name so that you can participate. There is no service charge to reinvest distributions, nor are there brokerage charges for shares issued directly by the fund. However, when shares are bought on the New York Stock Exchange or otherwise on the open market, each participant pays a pro rata share of the transaction expenses, including commissions. The automatic reinvestment of distributions does not relieve you of any income tax that may be payable (or required to be withheld) on the distributions.

You may withdraw from the Plan at any time by going to the Plan Agent's website at www.computershare.com, by calling 1-800-637-2304 any business day from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Eastern time or by writing to the Plan Agent at P.O. Box 43078, Providence, RI 02940-3078. Please have available the name of the fund and your account number. For certain types of registrations, such as corporate accounts, instructions must be submitted in writing. Please call for additional details. When you withdraw from the Plan, you can receive the value of the reinvested shares in one of three ways: your full shares will be held in your account and a check will be issued for the value of any fractional shares, the Plan Agent will sell your shares and send the proceeds to you, or you may sell your shares through your investment professional.

If you have any questions or for further information or a copy of the Plan, contact the Plan Agent Computershare Trust Company, N.A. (the Transfer Agent for the fund) at 1-800-637-2304, at the Plan Agent's website at www.computershare.com, or by writing to the Plan Agent at P.O. Box 43078, Providence, RI 02940-3078.

Table of Contents**PORTFOLIO OF INVESTMENTS**

11/30/08

The Portfolio of Investments is a complete list of all securities owned by your fund. It is categorized by broad-based asset classes.

Municipal Bonds - 158.4%

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Airport and Port Revenue - 0.2%		
New York, NY, City Industrial Development Authority Rev. (Terminal One Group Assn.), 5.5%, 2021	\$ 250,000	\$ 221,923
General Obligations - General Purpose - 5.1%		
Chicago, IL (Emergency Telecommunications Systems), FGIC, 5.5%, 2023	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,030,650
Chicago, IL, A, AMBAC, 6.25%, 2014	1,480,000	1,643,806
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Public Improvement, A, 5%, 2030 (a)	415,000	408,074
Highlands Ranch, CO, Metropolitan District, FSA, 6.5%, 2011	650,000	713,934
Highlands Ranch, CO, Metropolitan District, ETM, FSA, 6.5%, 2011 (c)	725,000	806,715
State of California, 5.75%, 2019	70,000	70,233
		\$ 4,673,412
General Obligations - Improvement - 1.8%		
St. Clair County, IL, Public Building Capital Appreciation, B, FGIC, 0%, 2013	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,649,920
General Obligations - Schools - 6.9%		
Frenship, TX, Independent School District, FSA, 5%, 2033	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 898,410
Modesto, CA, High School District (Stanislaus County), A, FGIC, 0%, 2019	1,350,000	763,358
Pomona, CA, Unified School District, A, MBIA, 6.45%, 2022	1,000,000	1,044,740
San Lorenzo, CA, Unified School District, Alameda County, Election 2004, B, FGIC, 4.75%, 2037	640,000	520,544
St. Johns, MI, Public Schools, FGIC, 5.1%, 2025	1,000,000	998,700
West Contra Costa, CA, Unified School District, B, MBIA, 6%, 2024	250,000	253,828
Will County, IL, School District (Channahon), AMBAC, 8.5%, 2015	1,400,000	1,780,100
		\$ 6,259,680
Healthcare Revenue - Hospitals - 29.6%		
Allegheny County, PA, Hospital Development Authority Rev. (West Penn Allegheny Health), A, 5.375%, 2040	\$ 405,000	\$ 227,598
Arizona Health Facilities Authority Rev. (Banner Health System), D, 5.5%, 2038	535,000	451,856
Boone County, MO, Hospital Rev., (Boone Hospital Center), 5.375%, 2038	125,000	95,111

13

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Healthcare Revenue - Hospitals - continued		
Boone County, MO, Hospital Rev., (Boone Hospital Center), 5.625%, 2038	\$ 120,000	\$ 95,053
Brunswick, GA, Hospital Authority Rev. (Glynn-Brunswick Memorial Hospital), 5.625%, 2034	165,000	132,228
California Health Facilities Financing Authority Rev. (Catholic Healthcare West), I, 4.95%, 2026 (a)	200,000	190,260
California Statewide Communities Development Authority Rev. (Catholic Healthcare West) K, ASSD GTY, 5.5%, 2041	335,000	265,457
California Statewide Communities Development Authority Rev. (Children s Hospital), 5%, 2047	575,000	339,842
California Statewide Communities Development Authority Rev. (Enloe Medical Center), CHCLI, 5.75%, 2038	360,000	295,931
California Statewide Communities Development Authority Rev. (St. Joseph Health System), FGIC, 5.75%, 2047	490,000	425,991
Colorado Health Facilities Authority Rev. (Poudre Valley Health Care, Inc.), B, FSA, 5.25%, 2036	200,000	152,842
Colorado Health Facilities Authority Rev. (Poudre Valley Health Care, Inc.), C, FSA, 5.25%, 2040	175,000	131,695
District of Columbia Hospital Rev. (Children s Hospital Obligations Group), FSA, 5.25%, 2045	370,000	316,983
Harris County, TX, Health Facilities Development Authority, Hospital Rev. (Memorial Hermann Healthcare Systems), B, 7.25%, 2035	250,000	248,835
Health Care Authority for Baptist Health, AL, D, 5%, 2021	850,000	699,406
Henderson, NV, Health Care Facilities Rev. (Catholic West), A, 6.75%, 2010 (c)	440,000	478,509
Henderson, NV, Health Care Facilities Rev. (Catholic West), A, 6.75%, 2010 (c)	60,000	64,716
Illinois Development Finance Authority Hospital Rev. (Adventist Health Systems Sunbelt Obligatory), 5.5%, 2009 (c)	900,000	946,224
Illinois Finance Authority Rev. (Children s Memorial Hospital), A, ASSD GTY, 5.25%, 2047	540,000	403,574
Illinois Finance Authority Rev. (Edward Hospital), A, AMBAC, 5.5%, 2040	470,000	377,922
Illinois Finance Authority Rev. (KishHealth Systems Obligations Group), 5.75%, 2028	380,000	322,951
Illinois Health Facilities Authority Rev. (Swedish American Hospital), 6.875%, 2010 (c)	500,000	532,670
Indiana Finance Authority Rev. (Sisters of St. Francis Health Services), 5.375%, 2032	225,000	191,234
Indiana Health & Educational Facilities Authority, Hospital Rev. (Community Foundation of Northwest Indiana), 5.5%, 2037	845,000	589,861
Indiana Health & Educational Facilities Finance Authority, Hospital Rev. (Clarian Health), A, 5%, 2039	390,000	258,118

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Healthcare Revenue - Hospitals - continued		
Indiana Health & Educational Facilities Financing Authority Rev. (Sisters of St. Francis Health Services, Inc.), E, FSA, 5.25%, 2041	\$ 515,000	\$ 452,963
Indiana Health Facilities Financing Authority Rev. (Community Foundation of Northwest Indiana), A, 6%, 2034	150,000	112,490
Jackson, TN, Town Hospital Rev. (Jackson-Madison County General Hospital), 5.5%, 2033	190,000	156,264
Jackson, TN, Town Hospital Rev. (Jackson-Madison County General Hospital), 5.75%, 2041	380,000	314,021
Johnson City, TN, Health & Educational Facilities Board Hospital Rev. (Mountain States Health), A, 5.5%, 2036	845,000	555,985
Knox County, TN, Health Educational & Housing Facilities, Board Rev. (University Health Systems, Inc.), 5.25%, 2036	330,000	218,259
Lake County, OH, Hospital Facilities Rev. (Lake Hospital), C, 6%, 2043	265,000	209,271
Louisiana Public Facilities Authority Hospital Rev. (Lake Charles Memorial Hospital), 6.375%, 2034	380,000	274,003
Louisville & Jefferson County, KY, Metro Government Health Facilities Rev. (Jewish Hospital, St. Mary's Healthcare), 6.125%, 2037	255,000	216,416
Louisville & Jefferson County, KY, Metropolitan Government Healthcare Systems Rev. (Norton Healthcare, Inc.), 5.25%, 2036	385,000	270,928
Lufkin, TX, Health Facilities Development Corp. Rev. (Memorial Health System), 5.5%, 2032	45,000	31,174
Lufkin, TX, Health Facilities Development Corp. Rev. (Memorial Health System), 5.5%, 2037	45,000	30,213
Maryland Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Lifebridge Health), ASSD GTY, 5%, 2034	250,000	202,100
Maryland Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Medstar Health), BHAC, 5.25%, 2046	365,000	326,325
Maryland Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Mercy Medical Center), A, 5.5%, 2042	300,000	207,846
Maryland Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (University of Maryland Medical System), 6.75%, 2010 (c)	250,000	272,290
Maryland Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Washington County Hospital), 5.75%, 2038	65,000	45,162
Maryland Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Washington County Hospital), 6%, 2043	95,000	67,281
Massachusetts Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Boston Medical Center), 5.25%, 2038	110,000	77,927
Massachusetts Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Milford-Whitinsville Regional), C, 5.75%, 2013	430,000	398,993
Massachusetts Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Quincy Medical Center), A, 6.5%, 2038	165,000	121,498

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Healthcare Revenue - Hospitals - continued		
Massachusetts Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (South Shore Hospital), R , 5.75%, 2009 (c)	\$ 630,000	\$ 652,516
Massachusetts Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev., Unrefunded (South Shore Hospital), F , 5.75%, 2029	370,000	308,943
New Hampshire Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Catholic Medical Center), A , 6.125%, 2012 (c)	440,000	500,553
New Hampshire Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Catholic Medical Center), 2032	60,000	43,734
New Hampshire Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Memorial Hospital at Conway), 5.25%, 2036	300,000	197,604
New Jersey Health Care Facilities, Financing Authority Rev. (St. Peter s University Hospital), 5.75%, 2037	415,000	307,017
New York Dormitory Authority Rev. (North Shore Long Island Jewish Group), 5.5%, 2013 (c)	100,000	112,543
New York Dormitory Authority Rev., Non-State Supported Debt (Mt. Sinai NYU Health), 5.5%, 2026	200,000	155,600
Northampton County, PA, General Purpose Authority Hospital Rev. (St. Luke s Hospital), A , 5.5%, 2035	100,000	69,857
Northampton County, PA, General Purpose Authority Hospital Rev. (St. Luke s Hospital), A , 5.5%, 2040	115,000	78,391
Orange County, FL, Health Facilities Authority Hospital Rev. (Orlando Regional Healthcare), 5.75%, 2012 (c)	150,000	167,454
Orange County, FL, Health Facilities Authority Hospital Rev. (Orlando Regional Healthcare), C , ETM, 6.25%, 2013 (c)	1,740,000	1,956,508
Orange County, FL, Health Facilities Authority Hospital Rev. (Orlando Regional Healthcare), E , 6%, 2009 (c)	5,000	5,247
Orange County, FL, Health Facilities Authority Hospital Rev. (Orlando Regional Healthcare), E , 6%, 2026	170,000	150,652
Philadelphia, PA, Hospitals & Higher Education Facilities Authority Rev. (Temple University Hospital), A , 5.5%, 2030	395,000	260,799
Philadelphia, PA, Hospitals & Higher Educational Facilities Rev. (Temple University), A , 6.625%, 2023	335,000	272,167
Rhode Island Health & Educational Building Corp., Hospital Financing (Lifespan Obligated Group), 6.375%, 2012 (c)	435,000	479,579
Rhode Island Health & Educational Building Corp., Hospital Financing (Lifespan Obligated Group), 6.375%, 2021	65,000	63,912
Ross County, OH, Hospital Rev. (Adena Health System), 5.75%, 2035	325,000	263,237
Saline County, MO, Industrial Development Authority Rev. (John Fitzgibbon Memorial Hospital, Inc.), 5.625%, 2035	500,000	325,990
Scioto County, OH, Hospital Facilities Rev. (Southern Ohio Medical Center), 5.75%, 2038	555,000	444,660
Skagit County, WA, Public Hospital District No. 001, 5.75%, 2032	285,000	196,297

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Healthcare Revenue - Hospitals - continued		
South Carolina Jobs Economic Development Authority (Bon Secours - Venice Healthcare Corp.), 5.5%, 2012 (c)	\$ 110,000	\$ 122,075
South Carolina Jobs Economic Development Authority (Bon Secours - Venice Healthcare Corp.), 5.5%, 2023	390,000	343,808
Southwestern, IL, Development Authority Rev. (Anderson Hospital), 5.375%, 2015	380,000	340,058
Southwestern, IL, Development Authority Rev. (Anderson Hospital), 5.125%, 2036	1,000,000	660,660
St. Paul, MN, Housing & Redevelopment Authority Healthcare Facilities Rev. (Healthpartners Obligations Group), 5.25%, 2023	325,000	243,103
St. Paul, MN, Housing & Redevelopment Hospital (Healthpartners Obligations Group), 5.25%, 2036	615,000	401,903
St. Paul, MN, Port Authority Lease Rev. (Regions Hospital), 1 , 5%, 2036	675,000	403,907
Sullivan County, TN, Health, Educational & Housing Facilities Board Hospital Rev. (Wellmont Health Systems Project), C , 5.25%, 2026	1,000,000	709,080
Sullivan County, TN, Health, Educational & Housing Facilities Board Hospital Rev. (Wellmont Health Systems Project), C , 5.25%, 2036	135,000	87,279
Sumner County, TN, Health, Educational & Housing Facilities Board Rev. (Sumner Regional Health), A , 5.5%, 2046	1,000,000	679,670
Tarrant County, TX, Cultural Education Facilities Finance Corp. (Scott & White Memorial Hospital), A , 5.5%, 2031	85,000	73,976
Tyler, TX, Health Facilities Development Corp. (East Texas Medical Center), A , 5.25%, 2032	265,000	174,953
Tyler, TX, Health Facilities Development Corp. (East Texas Medical Center), A , 5.375%, 2037	220,000	143,396
University of Kansas Hospital Authority Health Facilities Rev. (KU Health Systems), 5.625%, 2012 (c)	500,000	555,310
Washington Health Care Facilities Authority Rev. (Highline Medical Center), FHA, 6.25%, 2036	700,000	661,339
Washington Health Care Facilities Authority Rev. (Mason Medical), A , 6.25%, 2042	570,000	398,977
West Virginia Hospital Finance Authority, Hospital Rev. (Thomas Health System), 6.5%, 2038	285,000	205,932
Wisconsin Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Aurora Health Care, Inc.), 6.4%, 2033	175,000	135,963
Wisconsin Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Fort Healthcare, Inc. Project), 5.375%, 2018	385,000	325,587
Wisconsin Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Wheaton Franciscan Services), 5.25%, 2034	695,000	430,726
		\$ 26,907,238

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Healthcare Revenue - Long Term Care - 8.1%		
Abilene, TX, Health Facilities Development Corp., Retirement Facilities Rev. (Sears Methodist Retirement), A, 7%, 2033	\$ 500,000	\$ 380,610
Bucks County, PA, Industrial Development Authority Retirement Community Rev. (Ann's Choice, Inc.), A, 6.125%, 2025	500,000	372,525
Capital Projects Finance Authority, FL (Glenridge on Palmer Ranch), A, 8%, 2012 (c)	500,000	576,820
Chartiers Valley, PA, Industrial & Commercial Development Authority Rev. (Friendship Village South), A, 5.25%, 2013	500,000	453,670
Chester County, PA, Industrial Development Authority Rev. (RHA Nursing Home), 8.5%, 2032	720,000	624,614
Connecticut Development Authority First Mortgage Gross Rev., Health Care Project (Elim Park Baptist, Inc. Project), 5.75%, 2023	250,000	198,785
Delaware County, PA, Industrial Development Authority Rev. (Care Institute-Main Line LLC), 9%, 2031 (d)	535,000	234,469
Fulton County, GA, Residential Care Facilities (Canterbury Court), A, 6.125%, 2034	250,000	173,788
Fulton County, GA, Residential Care Facilities, First Mortgage (Lenbrook Square Foundation, Inc.), A, 5%, 2029	270,000	169,412
Illinois Finance Authority Rev. (Hoosier Care, Inc.), A, 7.125%, 2034	435,000	327,577
Illinois Finance Authority Rev. (Smith Village), A, 6.25%, 2035	500,000	353,840
Illinois Health Facilities Authority Rev. (Lutheran Senior Ministries, Inc.), 7.375%, 2011 (c)	250,000	284,518
Illinois Health Facilities Authority Rev. (Smith Crossing), A, 7%, 2032	250,000	199,948
Johnson City, TN, Health & Educational Facilities Board (Appalachian Christian Village), A, 6.25%, 2032	250,000	180,295
Juneau, AK, City & Borough Non-Recourse Rev. (St. Ann's Care Project), 6.875%, 2025	440,000	357,421
Kentwood, MI, Economic Development Ltd. (Holland Home), A, 5.375%, 2036	500,000	338,755
La Verne, CA, COP (Brethren Hillcrest Homes), B, 6.625%, 2025	350,000	279,262
Lee County, FL, Industrial Development Authority Health Care Facilities Rev. (Shell Point Village), A, 5.5%, 2009 (c)	175,000	183,302
Massachusetts Development Finance Agency Rev. (Loomis Communities, Inc.), A, 5.625%, 2015	200,000	181,662
Montgomery County, PA, Industrial Development Authority Rev. (Whitemarsh Continuing Care), 6.125%, 2028	200,000	136,060
Montgomery County, PA, Industrial Development Authority Rev. (Whitemarsh Continuing Care), 6.25%, 2035	300,000	196,794
New Jersey Economic Development Authority Rev. (Lions Gate), A, 5.75%, 2025	310,000	224,589

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Healthcare Revenue - Long Term Care - continued		
New Jersey Economic Development Authority Rev. (Lions Gate), A , 5.875%, 2037	\$ 100,000	\$ 66,385
Savannah, GA, Economic Development Authority, First Mortgage (Marshes of Skidway), A , 7.4%, 2024	250,000	216,578
Shelby County, TN, Health, Educational & Housing Facilities Board Rev. (Germantown Village), A , 7.25%, 2034	150,000	111,582
South Carolina Jobs & Economic Development Authority, Health Facilities Rev. (Wesley Commons), 5.3%, 2036	250,000	156,008
Suffolk County, NY, Industrial Development Agency, Civic Facilities Rev. (Gurwin Jewish Phase II), 6.7%, 2039	500,000	367,805
		\$ 7,347,074
Healthcare Revenue - Other - 0.3%		
Massachusetts Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Civic Investments, Inc.), A , 9%, 2012 (c)	\$ 250,000	\$ 286,513
Human Services - 0.2%		
Massachusetts Development Finance Agency Rev. (Evergreen Center, Inc.), 5%, 2024	\$ 250,000	\$ 172,618
Industrial Revenue - Airlines - 0.1%		
Chicago, IL, O Hare International Airport Special Facilities Rev. (American Airlines, Inc.), 5.5%, 2030	\$ 105,000	\$ 40,596
Dallas Fort Worth, TX, International Airport Facility Improvement Corp. (American Airlines, Inc.), 5.5%, 2030	105,000	39,600
		\$ 80,196
Industrial Revenue - Chemicals - 0.4%		
Brazos River, TX, Harbor Navigation District (Dow Chemical Co.), B-2 , 4.95%, 2033	\$ 500,000	\$ 345,900
Industrial Revenue - Other - 3.5%		
California Statewide Communities Development Authority Facilities (Microgy Holdings Project), 9%, 2038	\$ 200,000	\$ 169,000
Gulf Coast, TX, Industrial Development Authority Rev. (CITGO Petroleum Corp.), 8%, 2028	250,000	221,235
Houston, TX, Industrial Development Corp. (United Parcel Service, Inc.), 6%, 2023	345,000	264,129
Indianapolis, IN, Airport Authority Rev., Special Facilities (FedEx Corp.), 5.1%, 2017	250,000	200,228
Michigan Strategic Fund Ltd. Obligation Rev. (Michigan Sugar Co., Carrollton), 6.55%, 2025	250,000	187,148
New Jersey Economic Development Authority Rev. (GMT Realty LLC), B , 6.875%, 2037	500,000	396,900

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Industrial Revenue - Other - continued		
Toledo Lucas County, OH, Authority Port Rev., Facilities (CSX, Inc. Project), 6.45%, 2021	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 843,060
Washington County, NE, Wastewater Facilities Rev. (Cargill, Inc. Project), 5.9%, 2027	1,000,000	908,730
		\$ 3,190,430
Industrial Revenue - Paper - 1.4%		
Camden, AL, Industrial Development Board Exempt Facilities Rev., B (Weyerhaeuser Co.), 6.375%, 2024	\$ 275,000	\$ 305,223
Camden, AR, Environmental Improvement Rev. (International Paper Co.), A, 5%, 2018	500,000	354,035
Escambia County, FL, Environmental Improvement Rev. (International Paper Co.), A, 5.75%, 2027	250,000	163,918
Lowndes County, MS, Solid Waste Disposal & Pollution Control Rev. (Weyerhaeuser Co.), B, 6.7%, 2022	325,000	276,910
Rockdale County, GA, Development Authority Project Rev. (Visy Paper Project), A, 6.125%, 2034	320,000	214,294
		\$ 1,314,380
Miscellaneous Revenue - Entertainment & Tourism - 0.8%		
Cabazon Band Mission Indians, CA, 8.375%, 2015 (z)	\$ 100,000	\$ 93,632
Cabazon Band Mission Indians, CA, 8.75%, 2019 (z)	360,000	333,659
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, OR, C, 5.625%, 2026 (n)	350,000	252,109
New York Liberty Development Corp. Rev. (National Sports Museum), A, 6.125%, 2019	250,000	37,500
		\$ 716,900
Miscellaneous Revenue - Other - 2.5%		
Austin, TX, Convention Center (Convention Enterprises, Inc.), A, XLCA, 5.25%, 2019	\$ 190,000	\$ 165,859
Austin, TX, Convention Center (Convention Enterprises, Inc.), A, XLCA, 5.25%, 2020	155,000	131,869
Austin, TX, Convention Center (Convention Enterprises, Inc.), A, XLCA, 5.25%, 2024	90,000	71,134
District of Columbia Rev. (Smithsonian Institution), 5%, 2028	1,000,000	957,140
Oklahoma Industries Authority Rev. (Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation Project), 5.5%, 2029	600,000	510,648
Summit County, OH, Port Authority Building Rev. (Seville Project), A, 5.1%, 2025	440,000	350,420
V Lakes Utility District Ranking Water Systems Rev., 7%, 2037	85,000	63,669
		\$ 2,250,739

Edgar Filing: MFS INVESTMENT GRADE MUNICIPAL TRUST - Form N-CSR

Table of Contents

Portfolio of Investments continued

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Multi-Family Housing Revenue - 6.5%		
Broward County, FL, Housing Finance Authority Rev. (Chaves Lakes Apartments Ltd.), A , 7.5%, 2040	\$ 500,000	\$ 436,740
Capital Trust Agency, FL, Housing Rev. (Atlantic Housing Foundation), B , 7%, 2032	370,000	302,360
Charter Mac Equity Issuer Trust, FHLMC, 6.3%, 2019 (n)	500,000	445,200
Charter Mac Equity Issuer Trust, B , FHLMC, 7.6%, 2050 (a)(n)	500,000	514,525
Clay County, FL, Housing Finance Authority Rev. (Madison Commons Apartments), A , 7.45%, 2040	245,000	205,837
District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency (Henson Ridge), E , FHA, 5.1%, 2037	500,000	361,245
Durham, NC, Durham Housing Authority Rev. (Magnolia Pointe Apartments), 5.65%, 2038 (a)	398,060	308,198
Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency Rev., B , 5%, 2030	455,000	358,531
Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency Rev., E , 5%, 2028	250,000	185,273
Minneapolis, MN, Student Housing Rev. (Riverton Community Housing Project), A , 5.7%, 2040	250,000	174,528
MuniMae TE Bond Subsidiary LLC, 5.5%, 2049 (a)(z)	1,000,000	887,690
New Mexico Mortgage Finance Authority, Multi-Family Housing Rev. (Sun Pointe Apartments), E , FHA, 4.8%, 2040	500,000	337,870
Resolution Trust Corp., Pass-Through Certificates, 1993 , 8.5%, 2016 (z)	227,741	213,063
Seattle, WA, Housing Authority Rev., Capped Fund Program (High Rise Rehab), I , FSA, 5%, 2025	500,000	397,660
Tacoma, WA, Housing Authority Multi-Family Rev. (HSG-GNMA Collateral Mortgage Loans Redwood), GNMA, 5.05%, 2037	1,040,000	743,891
		\$ 5,872,611
Sales & Excise Tax Revenue - 1.7%		
Bolingbrook, IL, Sales Tax Rev., 6.25%, 2024	\$ 250,000	\$ 207,473
Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority, Sales Tax Rev., A-1 , 5.25%, 2029	350,000	346,941
Tampa Bay, FL, Sports Authority Rev. (Sales Tax-Tampa Bay Arena), MBIA, 5.75%, 2025	1,000,000	947,360
		\$ 1,501,774
Single Family Housing - Local - 0.9%		
Chicago, IL, Single Family Mortgage Rev., A , GNMA, 7.15%, 2031	\$ 15,000	\$ 14,805
Minneapolis & St. Paul Housing Authority Rev. (City Living), A-2 , GNMA, 5%, 2038	489,299	358,641
Pittsburgh, PA, Urban Redevelopment Authority Rev., C , GNMA, 4.8%, 2028	500,000	402,930
		\$ 776,376

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Single Family Housing - State - 2.8%		
Colorado Housing & Finance Authority Rev. (Single Family Project), B-2 , 7.25%, 2031	\$ 40,000	\$ 39,866
Maine Housing Authority Mortgage, A-2 , 4.95%, 2027	500,000	374,315
Montana Board Housing (Single Family Mortgage), A , 5%, 2036	840,000	598,273
North Dakota Housing Finance Agency Rev., A , 4.85%, 2021	470,000	376,179
Tennessee Housing Development Agency (Homeownership Program 2007), 4.65%, 2027	1,000,000	727,370
Virginia Housing Development Authority, Commonwealth Mortgage, A-5 , 4.4%, 2015	205,000	190,099
Virginia Housing Development Authority, Commonwealth Mortgage, A-5 , 4.4%, 2015	265,000	241,190
		\$ 2,547,292
Solid Waste Revenue - 2.3%		
Delaware County, PA, Industrial Development Authority Rev. (American Ref-Fuel), A , 6.1%, 2013	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 922,880
Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency, Resource Recovery Rev. (Ogden Haverhill Associates), A , 5.45%, 2012	1,250,000	1,160,900
		\$ 2,083,780
State & Agency - Other - 0.2%		
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Mepsi Campus), A , 6.25%, 2024	\$ 100,000	\$ 82,717
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Mepsi Campus), A , 6.5%, 2037	100,000	77,378
		\$ 160,095
State & Local Agencies - 18.2%		
Andover, MN, Economic Development Authority Public Facilities Lease Rev. (Andover Community Center), 5%, 2014 (j)	\$ 355,000	\$ 375,870
Andover, MN, Economic Development Authority Public Facilities Lease Rev. (Andover Community Center), 5%, 2019 (c)	245,000	248,317
Berkeley County, SC, School District Installment Lease (Securing Assets for Education), 5%, 2028	500,000	430,120
Dorchester County, SC, School District No. 2, Growth Remedy Opportunity Tax Hike, 5.25%, 2029	250,000	225,615
Golden State, CA, Tobacco Securitization Corp., Tobacco Settlement Rev., Enhanced, B , 5.5%, 2013 (c)	500,000	544,975
Hibbing, MN, Economic Development Authority Rev. (Public Project Hibbing Lease Obligations), 6.4%, 2012	335,000	324,571
Indiana Office Building Commission Correction Facilities Program Rev. (Women s Prison), B , AMBAC, 6.25%, 2016	2,820,000	3,138,209
Lancaster, SC, Educational Assistance Program, Inc., School District Lancaster County Project, 5%, 2026	550,000	463,364

Edgar Filing: MFS INVESTMENT GRADE MUNICIPAL TRUST - Form N-CSR

Table of Contents

Portfolio of Investments continued

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
State & Local Agencies - continued		
Laurens County, SC, School District No. 55, Installment Purchase Rev., 5.25%, 2030	\$ 350,000	\$ 286,496
Los Angeles County, CA, Schools Regionalized Business Service Corp., Capital Appreciation Pooled Financing, A, AMBAC, 0%, 2021	2,135,000	1,021,256
New York Dormitory Authority Rev. (City University) A, 5.75%, 2018	5,000,000	5,562,100
New York Urban Development Corp. Rev. (State Facilities), 5.6%, 2015	1,000,000	1,079,220
Newberry, SC, Investing in Children's Education (Newberry County School District Program), 5%, 2030	350,000	275,622
St. Louis, MO, Industrial Development Authority Leasehold Rev. (Convention Center Hotel), AMBAC, 0%, 2018	300,000	179,883
Utah Building Ownership Authority Lease Rev. (State Facilities Master Lease Program), C, FSA, 5.5%, 2019	1,750,000	1,920,240
West Virginia Building Commission, Lease Rev. (WV Regional Jail), A, AMBAC, 5.375%, 2018	500,000	522,240
		\$ 16,598,098
Student Loan Revenue - 2.1%		
Massachusetts Educational Financing Authority, Education Loan Rev., H, ASSD GTY, 6.35%, 2030	\$ 550,000	\$ 509,988
Nebhelp, Inc., Nebraska Rev. Jr., A-6, MBIA, 6.45%, 2018	1,500,000	1,384,860
		\$ 1,894,848
Tax - Other - 4.1%		
Dallas County, TX, Flood Control District, 7.25%, 2032	\$ 500,000	\$ 443,820
Dona Ana County, NM, Gross Receipts Tax Rev., AMBAC, 5.5%, 2015	1,000,000	1,112,830
New Jersey Economic Development Authority Rev. (Cigarette Tax), 5.75%, 2029	385,000	283,741
New York, NY, Transitional Finance Authority Rev., A, 5%, 2026 (f)	1,960,000	1,896,790
		\$ 3,737,181
Tax Assessment - 6.0%		
Atlanta, GA, Tax Allocation (Eastside Project), A, 5.625%, 2016	\$ 400,000	\$ 352,504
Celebration Community Development District, FL, A, 6.4%, 2034	230,000	186,042
Chicago, IL, Tax Increment Allocation (Pilsen Redevelopment), B, 6.75%, 2022	610,000	548,219
Double Branch Community Development District, FL, A, 6.7%, 2034	315,000	262,137
Du Page County, IL, Special Service Area (Monarch Landing Project), 5.4%, 2016	250,000	228,823

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Tax Assessment - continued		
Grand Bay at Doral Community Development District, FL, B , 6%, 2017	\$ 405,000	\$ 330,610
Heritage Harbour North Community Development District, FL, Capital Improvement Rev., 6.375%, 2038	140,000	103,673
Huntington Beach, CA, Community Facilities District, Special Tax (Grand Coast Resort), 2000-1 , 6.45%, 2031	300,000	251,181
Lincoln, CA, Special Tax (Community Facilities District) , 2003-1 , 5.55%, 2013 (c)	445,000	507,224
Lincolnshire, IL, Special Service Area No. 1 (Sedgebrook Project), 6.25%, 2034	225,000	165,755
Magnolia Park Community Development District, FL, Special Assessment, A , 6.15%, 2039	185,000	132,741
Plano, IL, Special Service Area No. 4 (Lakewood Springs Project Unit 5-B), 6%, 2035	750,000	520,208
Portage, IN, Economic Development Rev. (Ameriplex Project), 5%, 2027	105,000	76,755
Riverside, MO, Tax Increment Rev. (L-385 Levee Project), 5.25%, 2020	500,000	472,750
Seven Oaks, FL, Community Development District II Special Assessment Rev., A , 5.875%, 2035	470,000	301,040
Seven Oaks, FL, Community Development District II Special Assessment Rev., B , 5%, 2009	150,000	124,404
Tolomato Community Development District, FL, Special Assessment, 6.65%, 2040	100,000	80,271
Volo Village, IL, Special Service Area No. 3, Special Tax (Symphony Meadows Project), 1 , 6%, 2036	250,000	177,058
West Villages Improvement District, FL, Special Assessment Rev. (Unit of Development No. 3), 5.5%, 2037	495,000	305,341
Westridge, FL, Community Development District, Capital Improvement Rev., 5.8%, 2037 (d)	490,000	300,978
		\$ 5,427,714
Tobacco - 4.4%		
Badger, WI, Tobacco Asset Securitization Corp., 6.375%, 2032	\$ 250,000	\$ 225,175
Buckeye, OH, Tobacco Settlement Rev., Asset Backed, A-2 , 5.875%, 2030	480,000	319,982
Buckeye, OH, Tobacco Settlement Rev., Asset Backed, A-2 , 5.875%, 2047	1,405,000	872,758
Buckeye, OH, Tobacco Settlement Rev., Asset Backed, A-2 , 6.5%, 2047	635,000	435,070
Golden State, CA, Tobacco Securitization Corp., Tobacco Settlement Rev., A-1 , 6.25%, 2013 (c)	700,000	743,610

Table of Contents

Portfolio of Investments continued

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Tobacco - continued		
Inland Empire, CA, Tobacco Securitization Corp., Tobacco Settlement Rev., Asset Backed, C-1, 0%, 2036	\$ 250,000	\$ 17,723
Michigan Tobacco Settlement Finance Authority Rev., Asset Backed, A, 6%, 2048	1,380,000	878,839
South Carolina Tobacco Settlement Authority Rev., B, 6.375%, 2011 (c)	400,000	429,756
Virginia Tobacco Settlement Financing Corp., B-1, 5%, 2047	105,000	59,945
		\$ 3,982,858
Toll Roads - 2.2%		
Northwest Parkway, CO, Public Highway Authority (First Tier), D, 7.125%, 2011 (c)	\$ 495,000	\$ 523,096
San Joaquin Hills, CA, Transportation Corridor Agency Toll Road Rev., A, MBIA, 0%, 2015	2,000,000	1,505,300
		\$ 2,028,396
Transportation - Special Tax - 1.3%		
Regional Transportation Authority, IL, C, FGIC, 7.75%, 2020	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,223,880
Universities - Colleges - 27.0%		
Anderson, IN, Economic Development Rev. (Anderson University Project), 5%, 2028	\$ 225,000	\$ 147,276
Broward County, FL, Educational Facilities Authority (Nova Southeastern), B, 5.5%, 2024	155,000	126,048
California Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (California Lutheran University), 5.75%, 2038	350,000	266,711
California Municipal Finance Authority Rev. (Biola University), 5.8%, 2028	100,000	79,041
California State University Rev., A, AMBAC, 5%, 2026	960,000	888,154
Chicago, IL, State University Rev. Auxiliary Facilities Systems, MBIA, 5.5%, 2023	1,085,000	1,132,089
District of Columbia Rev. (Georgetown University), BHAC, 0% to 2018, 5% to 2040	1,430,000	597,383
Harris County, TX, Cultural Education Facilities Rev. (Baylor College of Medicine), D, 5.625%, 2032	280,000	250,043
Harrisburg, PA, University of Science, A, 5.4%, 2016	150,000	128,096
Illinois Finance Authority Rev. (Illinois Institute of Technology), A, 5%, 2031	335,000	239,515
Illinois Finance Authority Rev. (Illinois Institute of Technology), A, 5%, 2036	240,000	165,475
Lubbock, TX, Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Lubbock Christian University), 5.125%, 2027	285,000	211,367

Table of Contents*Portfolio of Investments continued*

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Universities - Colleges - continued		
Lubbock, TX, Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Lubbock Christian University), 5.25%, 2037	\$ 255,000	\$ 178,548
Marietta, GA, Development Facilities Authority Rev. (Life University), 7%, 2030	100,000	81,595
Marietta, GA, Development Facilities Authority Rev. (Life University), 7%, 2039	100,000	78,778
Massachusetts Development Finance Agency Rev. (Western New England College), 6.125%, 2012 (c)	315,000	355,100
Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County, TN, Health & Educational Facilities Board Rev. (Meharry Medical College), AMBAC, 6%, 2016	1,575,000	1,761,386
Miami-Dade County, FL, Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (University of Miami), A, 5.75%, 2028	125,000	116,188
Michigan Higher Education Facilities Authority Rev. (College for Creative Studies), 6.125%, 2037	475,000	361,057
Missouri Health & Educational Facilities Authority Rev. (Central Institute for the Deaf), RADIANT, 5.85%, 2010 (c)	600,000	628,788
New York Dormitory Authority Rev. (Columbia University), 5%, 2038 (u)	15,000,000	13,930,350
San Leanna, TX, Educational Facilities Corp., Higher Education Rev. (Saint Edwards University), 5.125%, 2036	115,000	75,889
University of Minnesota, A, ETM, 5.75%, 2014 (c)	500,000	576,505
University of Minnesota, A, ETM, 5.5%, 2021 (c)	2,000,000	2,162,100
		\$ 24,537,482
Universities - Dormitories - 0.6%		
California Statewide Communities Development Authority Rev. (Lancer Educational Student Housing Project), 5.625%, 2033	\$ 500,000	\$ 319,695
California Statewide Communities Development Authority Rev. (Student Housing, SUCI East Campus), 6%, 2040	220,000	168,045
Maryland Economic Development Corp. Student Housing (University of Maryland - College Park), 5.875%, 2043	130,000	99,835
		\$ 587,575
Universities - Secondary Schools - 0.2%		
Colorado Educational & Cultural Facilities Authority Rev. (Charter School), 5.625%, 2040	\$ 230,000	\$ 173,133
Utilities - Cogeneration - 1.1%		
Pennsylvania Economic Development Financing Authority Rev., Resource Recovery Rev. (Colver), G, 5.125%, 2015	\$ 375,000	\$ 279,150

Table of Contents

Portfolio of Investments continued

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Utilities - Cogeneration - continued		
Puerto Rico Industrial, Tourist, Educational, Medical & Environmental Central Facilities (Cogeneration Facilities - AES Puerto Rico Project), 6.625%, 2026	\$ 320,000	\$ 288,083
Suffolk County, NY, Industrial Development Agency Rev. (Nissequoque Cogeneration Partners Facilities), 5.5%, 2023	550,000	421,581
		\$ 988,814
Utilities - Investor Owned - 9.0%		
Brazos River Authority, TX, Pollution Control Rev. (Texas Utility Co.), A, 7.7%, 2033	\$ 250,000	\$ 162,093
Brazos River Authority, TX, Pollution Control Rev. (TXU Electric Co. LLC), C, 5.75%, 2036 (a)	100,000	81,751
Brazos River Authority, TX, Pollution Control Rev. (TXU Electric Co. LLC), C, 6.75%, 2038	270,000	151,573
Clark County, NV, Industrial Development Rev. (Nevada Power Co. Project), A, 5.9%, 2032	250,000	151,085
Clark County, NV, Industrial Development Rev. (Nevada Power Co. Project), B, 5.9%, 2030	250,000	153,615
Clark County, NV, Industrial Development Rev. (Southwest Gas Corp. Project), E, 5.8%, 2038 (a)	250,000	229,403
Matagorda County, TX, Navigation District 1 (Houston Lighting.), AMBAC, 5.125%, 2028	2,000,000	1,584,720
Michigan Strategic Fund, Ltd. Obligation Rev. (Detroit Edison), A, MBIA, 5.55%, 2029	3,000,000	2,237,490
Mississippi Business Finance Corp., Pollution Control Rev. (Systems Energy Resources Project), 5.875%, 2022	1,000,000	788,830
New Hampshire Business Finance Authority, Pollution Control Rev. (Public Service of New Hampshire), B, MBIA, 4.75%, 2021	250,000	198,620
Pennsylvania Economic Development Financing Authority Rev. (Reliant Energy Seward), A, 6.75%, 2036	200,000	123,664
Petersburg, IN, Pollution Control Rev. (Indianapolis Power & Light), MBIA, 5.4%, 2017	2,500,000	2,353,175
		\$ 8,216,019
Utilities - Municipal Owned - 0.8%		
North Carolina Municipal Power Agency No. 1, Catawba Electric Rev., A, MBIA, 5.5%, 2015	\$ 640,000	\$ 694,195
Utilities - Other - 2.6%		
Main Street Natural Gas, Inc., GA, Gas Project Rev., A, 5.5%, 2026	\$ 120,000	\$ 88,717
Main Street Natural Gas, Inc., GA, Gas Project Rev., A, 5.5%, 2028	250,000	181,220

Table of Contents

Portfolio of Investments continued

Issuer	Shares/Par	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds - continued		
Utilities - Other - continued		
Public Authority for Colorado Energy Natural Gas Purchase Rev., 6.5%, 2038	\$ 215,000	\$ 174,208
Salt Verde Financial Corp., AZ, Senior Gas Rev., 5%, 2032	795,000	527,172
Salt Verde Financial Corp., AZ, Senior Gas Rev., 5%, 2037	790,000	505,387
Tennessee Energy Acquisition Corp., Gas Rev., A, 5.25%, 2022	205,000	152,362
Tennessee Energy Acquisition Corp., Gas Rev., A, 5.25%, 2023	300,000	219,192
Tennessee Energy Acquisition Corp., Gas Rev., A, 5.25%, 2026	610,000	424,682
Tennessee Energy Acquisition Corp., Gas Rev., C, 5%, 2025	185,000	120,224
		\$ 2,393,164
Water & Sewer Utility Revenue - 3.5%		
Hampton Roads, VA, Sanitation District Wastewater Rev., 5%, 2033	\$ 140,000	\$ 132,455
Massachusetts Water Pollution Abatement, 5.25%, 2028	750,000	752,693
Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, B, FSA, 5.25%, 2029	600,000	591,030
Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Authority Rev., MBIA, 6.25%, 2012	1,000,000	1,140,070
Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Authority Rev., A, 6%, 2038	505,000	441,941
Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Authority Rev., A, 6%, 2044	195,000	169,810
		\$ 3,227,999
Total Investments (Identified Cost, \$161,846,138)		\$ 144,070,207
Other Assets, Less Liabilities - (4.8)%		(4,328,819)
Preferred Shares (Issued by the Fund) - (53.6)%		(48,750,000)
Net Assets applicable to common shares - 100.0%		\$ 90,991,388

(a) Mandatory tender date is earlier than stated maturity date.

(c) Refunded bond.

(d) Non-income producing security in default.

(f) All or a portion of the security has been segregated as collateral for open futures contracts.

(j) Crossover refunded bond.

(n) Securities exempt from registration under Rule 144A of the Securities Act of 1933. These securities may be sold in the ordinary course of business in transactions exempt from registration, normally to qualified institutional buyers. At period end, the aggregate value of these securities was \$1,211,834 representing 1.3% of net assets applicable to common shares.

(u) Underlying security deposited into special purpose trust (the trust) by investment banker upon creation of self-deposited inverse floaters.

Table of Contents

Portfolio of Investments continued

(z) Restricted securities are not registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and are subject to legal restrictions on resale. These securities generally may be resold in transactions exempt from registration or to the public if the securities are subsequently registered. Disposal of these securities may involve time-consuming negotiations and prompt sale at an acceptable price may be difficult. The fund holds the following restricted securities:

Restricted Securities	Acquisition Date	Cost	Current Market Value
Cabazon Band Mission Indians, CA, 8.375%, 2015	10/04/04	\$100,000	\$93,632
Cabazon Band Mission Indians, CA, 8.75%, 2019	10/04/04	360,000	333,659
MuniMae TE Bond Subsidiary LLC, 5.5%, 2049	11/02/05	1,000,000	887,690
Resolution Trust Corp., Pass-Through Certificates, 1993, 8.5%, 2016	8/27/93	232,276	213,063
Total Restricted Securities			\$1,528,044
% of Net Assets applicable to common shares			1.7%

Derivative contracts at 11/30/08

Futures contracts outstanding at 11/30/08

Description	Contracts	Value	Expiration Date	Unrealized Appreciation (Depreciation)
U.S. Treasury Note 10 yr (Short)	198	\$23,951,813	Mar-09	\$(706,068)
U.S. Treasury Bond 30 yr (Short)	85	10,836,172	Mar-09	(261,938)
				\$(968,006)

At November 30, 2008, the fund had sufficient cash and/or other liquid securities to cover any commitments under these derivative contracts.

The following abbreviations are used in this report and are defined:

COP Certificate of Participation
 ETM Escrowed to Maturity

Insurers

AMBAC	AMBAC Indemnity Corp.
ASSD GTY	Assured Guaranty Insurance Co.
BHAC	Berkshire Hathaway Assurance Corp.
CHCLI	California Health Construction Loan Insurance
FGIC	Financial Guaranty Insurance Co.
FHA	Federal Housing Administration
FHLMC	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp.
FSA	Financial Security Assurance Inc.
GNMA	Government National Mortgage Assn.
MBIA	MBIA Insurance Corp.
RADIAN	Radian Asset Assurance, Inc.
XLCA	XL Capital Insurance Co.

See Notes to Financial Statements

Table of Contents*Financial Statements***STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES**

At 11/30/08

This statement represents your fund's balance sheet, which details the assets and liabilities comprising the total value of the fund.

Assets	
Investments, at value (identified cost, \$161,846,138)	\$144,070,207
Cash	452,243
Receivable for investments sold	125,000
Interest receivable	2,965,334
Receivable from investment adviser	68,500
Other assets	17,124
Total assets	\$147,698,408
Liabilities	
Distributions payable on common shares	\$43,384
Distributions payable on preferred shares	12,887
Payable for daily variation margin on open futures contracts	153,422
Payable to the holder of the floating rate certificate from trust assets	7,500,000
Payable to affiliates	
Management fee	12,078
Transfer agent and dividend disbursing costs	2,524
Administrative services fee	554
Payable for independent trustees' compensation	14,618
Payable for interest expense and fees	89,659
Accrued expenses and other liabilities	127,894
Total liabilities	\$7,957,020
Preferred shares	
Auction preferred shares (2,400 shares issued, 1,950 shares outstanding at \$25,000 per share) at liquidation value	\$48,750,000
Net assets applicable to common shares	\$90,991,388
Net assets consist of	
Paid-in capital - common shares	\$126,888,080
Unrealized appreciation (depreciation) on investments	(18,743,937)
Accumulated net realized gain (loss) on investments	(17,302,773)
Undistributed net investment income	150,018
Net assets applicable to common shares	\$90,991,388
Preferred shares, at value (2,400 shares issued, 1,950 shares outstanding at \$25,000 per share)	48,750,000
Net assets including preferred shares	\$139,741,388
Common shares of beneficial interest outstanding	11,509,000
Net asset value per common share (net assets of \$90,991,388/11,509,000 shares of beneficial interest outstanding)	\$7.91
See Notes to Financial Statements	

Table of Contents*Financial Statements***STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS**

Year ended 11/30/08

This statement describes how much your fund earned in investment income and accrued in expenses.

It also describes any gains and/or losses generated by fund operations.

Net investment income		
Interest income		\$9,305,939
Expenses		
Management fee	\$1,101,181	
Transfer agent and dividend disbursing costs	27,384	
Administrative services fee	33,926	
Independent trustees compensation	16,024	
Stock exchange fee	21,379	
Preferred shares remarketing agent fee	144,206	
Custodian fee	31,438	
Shareholder communications	15,082	
Auditing fees	77,030	
Legal fees	64,528	
Interest expense and fees	145,908	
Miscellaneous	76,653	
Total expenses		\$1,754,739
Fees paid indirectly	(18,465)	
Reduction of expenses by investment adviser	(102,930)	
Net expenses		\$1,633,344
Net investment income		\$7,672,595
Realized and unrealized gain (loss) on investments		
Realized gain (loss) (identified cost basis)		
Investment transactions	\$(3,325,078)	
Futures contracts	(3,355,684)	
Net realized gain (loss) on investments		\$(6,680,762)
Change in unrealized appreciation (depreciation)		
Investments	\$(22,277,886)	
Futures contracts	(953,243)	
Net unrealized gain (loss) on investments		\$(23,231,129)
Net realized and unrealized gain (loss) on investments		\$(29,911,891)
Distributions declared to preferred shareholders		\$(2,043,380)
Change in net assets from operations		\$(24,282,676)
See Notes to Financial Statements		

Table of Contents*Financial Statements***STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS**

These statements describe the increases and/or decreases in net assets resulting from operations, any distributions, and any shareholder transactions.

	Years ended 11/30	
	2008	2007
Change in net assets		
From operations		
Net investment income	\$7,672,595	\$9,081,043
Net realized gain (loss) on investments	(6,680,762)	(4,581,812)
Net unrealized gain (loss) on investments	(23,231,129)	(6,996,386)
Distributions declared to preferred shareholders	(2,043,380)	(2,208,862)
Change in net assets from operations	\$(24,282,676)	\$(4,706,017)
Distributions declared to common shareholders		
From net investment income	\$(6,318,442)	\$(6,364,479)
Total change in net assets	\$(30,601,118)	\$(11,070,496)
Net assets applicable to common shares		
At beginning of period	121,592,506	132,663,002
At end of period (including undistributed net investment income of \$150,018 and \$162,215, respectively)	\$90,991,388	\$121,592,506
See Notes to Financial Statements		

Table of Contents*Financial Statements***FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS**

The financial highlights table is intended to help you understand the fund's financial performance for the past 5 years (or life of a particular share class, if shorter). Certain information reflects financial results for a single fund share. The total returns in the table represent the rate by which an investor would have earned (or lost) on an investment in the fund share class (assuming reinvestment of all distributions) held for the entire period.

	Years ended 11/30				
	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004
Net asset value, beginning of period	\$10.56	\$11.53	\$11.16	\$11.14	\$11.47
Income (loss) from investment operations					
Net investment income (d)	\$0.67	\$ 0.79(z)	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$0.74
Net realized and unrealized gain (loss) on investments	(2.59)	(1.02)(z)	0.37	0.05	(0.33)
Distributions declared to preferred shareholders	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.17)	(0.12)	(0.06)
Total from investment operations	\$(2.10)	\$(0.42)	\$0.95	\$0.68	\$0.35
Less distributions declared to common shareholders					
From net investment income	\$(0.55)	\$(0.55)	\$(0.58)	\$(0.66)	\$(0.68)
Net asset value, end of period	\$7.91	\$10.56	\$11.53	\$11.16	\$11.14
Common share market value, end of period	\$6.35	\$9.56	\$10.73	\$10.40	\$10.01
Total return at common market value (%) (p)	(29.32)	(6.12)	8.96	10.68	0.64
Total return at net asset value (%) (p)(t)	(20.30)	(3.50)	9.11	6.72	3.80
Ratios (%) (to average net assets applicable to common shares) and Supplemental data:					
Expenses before expense reductions (f)(p)	1.56	1.35	1.37	1.30	1.29
Expenses after expense reductions (f)(p)	1.47	1.32	1.34	1.30	N/A
Expenses after expense reductions and excluding interest expense and fees (f)(l)(p)	1.34	1.29	1.31	1.30	1.29
Net investment income (p)	6.82	7.10(z)	6.71	6.64	6.55
Portfolio turnover	34	24	34	16	15
Net assets at end of period (000 Omitted)	\$90,991	\$121,593	\$132,663	\$128,402	\$128,157

Table of Contents*Financial Highlights continued*

	Years ended 11/30				
	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004
Supplemental Ratios (%):					
Net investment income available to common shares	5.01	5.37	5.15	5.61	6.06
Senior Securities:					
Total preferred shares outstanding	1,950	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
Asset coverage per preferred share (k)	\$71,662	\$75,664	\$80,276	\$78,501	\$78,399
Involuntary liquidation preference per preferred share (o)	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,007	\$25,004	\$25,001
Average market value per preferred share (m)(x)	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000

(d) Per share data is based on average shares outstanding.

(f) Ratios do not reflect reductions from fees paid indirectly, if applicable.

(k) Calculated by subtracting the fund's total liabilities (not including preferred shares) from the trust's total assets and dividing this number by the number of preferred shares outstanding.

(l) Interest expense and fees relate to payments made to the holder of the floating rate certificate from trust assets.

(m) Amount excludes accrued unpaid distributions to Auction Preferred Shareholders.

(o) Effective November 30, 2007, amount excludes accrued unpaid distributions to Auction Preferred Shareholders.

(p) Ratio excludes dividend payment on auction preferred shares.

(t) Prior to November 30, 2007, total return at net asset value is unaudited.

(x) Average market value represents the approximate fair value of the fund's liability.

(z) The fund applied a change in estimate for amortization of premium on certain debt securities in the year ended November 30, 2007 that resulted in an increase of \$0.04 per share to net investment income, a decrease of \$0.04 per share to net realized and unrealized gain (loss) on investments, and an increase of 0.35% to the net investment income ratio. The change in estimate had no impact on net assets, net asset value per share or total return.

See Notes to Financial Statements

Table of Contents

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(1) Business and Organization

MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust (the fund) is organized as a Massachusetts business trust and is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, as a closed-end management investment company.

(2) Significant Accounting Policies

General The preparation of financial statements in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates. The value of municipal instruments can be affected by changes in their actual or perceived credit quality. The credit quality of municipal instruments can be affected by, among other things, the financial condition of the issuer or guarantor, the issuer's future borrowing plans and sources of revenue, the economic feasibility of the revenue bond project or general borrowing purpose, political or economic developments in the region where the instrument is issued and the liquidity of the security. Municipal instruments generally trade in the over-the-counter market. Municipal instruments backed by current and anticipated revenues from a specific project or specific assets can be negatively affected by the discontinuance of the taxation supporting the projects or assets or the inability to collect revenues for the project or from the assets. If the Internal Revenue Service determines an issuer of a municipal instrument has not complied with the applicable tax requirements, the security could decline in value, interest from the security could become taxable and the funds may be required to issue Forms 1099-DIV.

Investment Valuations Debt instruments and floating rate loans (other than short-term instruments), including restricted debt instruments, are generally valued at an evaluated or composite bid as reported by a third party pricing service. Short-term instruments with a maturity at issuance of 60 days or less may be valued at amortized cost, which approximates market value. Futures contracts are generally valued at last posted settlement price as reported by a third party pricing service on the market on which they are primarily traded. Futures contracts for which there were no trades that day for a particular position are generally valued at the closing bid quotation as reported by a third party pricing service on the market on which such futures contracts are primarily traded. Securities and other assets generally valued on the basis of information from a third party pricing service may also be valued at a broker-dealer bid quotation. Values obtained from pricing services can utilize both dealer-supplied valuations and electronic data processing techniques, which take into account factors such as institutional-size trading in similar groups of securities, yield, quality, coupon rate, maturity, type of issue, trading characteristics, and other market data.

The Board of Trustees has delegated primary responsibility for determining or causing to be determined the value of the fund's investments (including any fair

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

valuation) to the adviser pursuant to valuation policies and procedures approved by the Board. If the adviser determines that reliable market quotations are not readily available, investments are valued at fair value as determined in good faith by the adviser in accordance with such procedures under the oversight of the Board of Trustees. Under the fund's valuation policies and procedures, market quotations are not considered to be readily available for most types of debt instruments and floating rate loans and many types of derivatives. These investments are generally valued at fair value based on information from third party pricing services. In addition, investments may be valued at fair value if the adviser determines that an investment's value has been materially affected by events occurring after the close of the exchange or market on which the investment is principally traded (such as foreign exchange or market) and prior to the determination of the fund's net asset value, or after the halting of trading of a specific security where trading does not resume prior to the close of the exchange or market on which the security is principally traded. The adviser may rely on third party pricing services or other information (such as the correlation with price movements of similar securities in the same or other markets; the type, cost and investment characteristics of the security; the business and financial condition of the issuer; and trading and other market data) to assist in determining whether to fair value and at what value to fair value an investment. The value of an investment for purposes of calculating the fund's net asset value can differ depending on the source and method used to determine value. When fair valuation is used, the value of investments used to determine the fund's net asset value may differ from quoted or published prices for the same investments.

The fund adopted FASB Statement No. 157, Fair Value Measurements (the Statement). This Statement provides a single definition of fair value, a hierarchy for measuring fair value and expanded disclosures about fair value measurements.

Various inputs are used in determining the value of the fund's assets or liabilities carried at market value. These inputs are categorized into three broad levels. Level 1 includes quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities. Level 2 includes other significant observable market-based inputs (including quoted prices for similar securities, interest rates, prepayment speed, and credit risk). Level 3 includes unobservable inputs, which may include the adviser's own assumptions in determining the fair value of investments. Other financial instruments are derivative instruments not reflected in total investments, such as futures, forwards, swap contracts and written options, which are valued at the unrealized appreciation/depreciation on the instrument. The following is a summary of the levels used as of November 30, 2008 in valuing the fund's assets or liabilities carried at market value:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Investments in Securities	\$	\$144,070,207	\$	\$144,070,207
Other Financial Instruments	\$(968,006)	\$	\$	\$(968,006)

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

Derivative Risk The fund may invest in derivatives for hedging or non-hedging purposes. While hedging can reduce or eliminate losses, it can also reduce or eliminate gains. When the fund uses derivatives as an investment to gain market exposure, or for hedging purposes, gains and losses from derivative instruments may be substantially greater than the derivative's original cost. Cash that has been segregated on behalf of certain derivative contracts will be reported separately on the Statement of Assets and Liabilities as restricted cash. On some over-the-counter derivatives, the fund attempts to reduce its exposure to counterparty credit risk by entering into an ISDA Master Agreement on a bilateral basis with each of the counterparties with whom it undertakes a significant volume of transactions. The ISDA Master Agreement gives the fund the right, upon an event of default by the applicable counterparty, to close out all transactions traded under such agreement and to net amounts owed under each transaction to one net amount payable by one party to the other. This right to close out and net payments across all transactions traded under the ISDA Master Agreement could result in a reduction of the fund's credit risk to such counterparty equal to any amounts payable by the fund under the applicable transactions, if any. However, absent an event of default by the counterparty, the ISDA Master Agreement does not result in an offset of reported balance sheet assets and liabilities across transactions between the fund and the applicable counterparty. Derivative instruments include futures contracts and inverse floaters.

In March 2008, FASB Statement No. 161, Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities (the Standard) was issued, and is effective for financial statements issued for fiscal years and interim periods beginning after November 15, 2008. This Standard provides enhanced disclosures about the fund's use of and accounting for derivative instruments and the effect of derivative instruments on the fund's results of operations and financial position. Management is evaluating the application of the Standard to the fund, and has not at this time determined the impact, if any, resulting from the adoption of this Standard on the fund's financial statements.

Futures Contracts The fund may enter into futures contracts for the delayed delivery of securities or currency, or contracts based on financial indices at a fixed price on a future date. In entering such contracts, the fund is required to deposit with the broker either in cash or securities an amount equal to a certain percentage of the contract amount. Subsequent payments are made or received by the fund each day, depending on the daily fluctuations in the value of the contract, and are recorded for financial statement purposes as unrealized gains or losses by the fund. Upon entering into such contracts, the fund bears the risk of interest or exchange rates or securities prices moving unexpectedly, in which case, the fund may not achieve the anticipated benefits of the futures contracts and may realize a loss.

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

Inverse Floaters The fund invests in municipal inverse floating rate securities which are structured by the issuer (known as primary market inverse floating rate securities) or by an investment banker utilizing municipal bonds which have already been issued (known as secondary market inverse floating rate securities) to have variable rates of interest which typically move in the opposite direction of short term interest rates. A secondary market inverse floating rate security is created when an investment banker transfers a fixed rate municipal bond to a special purpose trust, and causes the trust to (a) issue floating rate certificates to third parties, in an amount equal to a fraction of the par amount of the deposited bonds (these certificates usually pay tax-exempt interest at short-term interest rates that typically reset weekly; and the certificate holders typically, on seven days notice, have the option to tender their certificates to the investment banker or another party for redemption at par plus accrued interest), and (b) issue inverse floating rate certificates (sometimes referred to as inverse floaters). If the holder of the inverse floater transfers the municipal bonds to an investment banker for the purpose of depositing the municipal bonds into the special purpose trust, the inverse floating rate certificates that are issued by the trust are referred to as self-deposited inverse floaters. If the bonds held by the trust are purchased by the investment banker for deposit into the trust from someone other than the purchasers of the inverse floaters, the inverse floating rate certificates that are issued by the trust are referred to as externally deposited inverse floaters. Such self-deposited inverse floaters held by the fund are accounted for as secured borrowings, with the municipal bonds reflected in the investments of the fund and amounts owed to the holder of the floating rate certificate under the provisions of the trust, which amounts are paid solely from the assets of the trust, reflected as liabilities of the fund in the Statement of Assets and Liabilities under the caption, Payable to the holder of the floating rate certificate from trust assets. At November 30, 2008, the fund's payable to the holder of the floating rate certificate from trust assets was \$7,500,000 and the interest rate on these floating rate certificates issued by the trust was 0.89%. For the year ended November 30, 2008, the average daily payable to the holder of the floating rate certificate from trust assets was \$4,322,404 at a weighted average interest rate of 3.38%. Interest expense and fees relate to interest payments made to the holder of certain floating rate certificates and associated fees, both of which are made from trust assets. Interest expense and fees are recorded as incurred. For the year ended November 30, 2008, interest expense and fees in connection with self-deposited inverse floaters was \$145,908. Primary and externally deposited inverse floaters held by the fund are not accounted for as secured borrowings.

Indemnifications Under the fund's organizational documents, its officers and trustees may be indemnified against certain liabilities and expenses arising

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

out of the performance of their duties to the fund. Additionally, in the normal course of business, the fund enters into agreements with service providers that may contain indemnification clauses. The fund's maximum exposure under these agreements is unknown as this would involve future claims that may be made against the fund that have not yet occurred.

Investment Transactions and Income Investment transactions are recorded on the trade date. Interest income is recorded on the accrual basis. All premium and discount is amortized or accreted for financial statement purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

The fund may receive proceeds from litigation settlements. Any proceeds received from litigation involving portfolio holdings are reflected in the Statement of Operations in realized gain/loss if the security has been disposed of by the fund or in unrealized gain/loss if the security is still held by the fund. Any other proceeds from litigation not related to portfolio holdings are reflected as other income in the Statement of Operations.

Fees Paid Indirectly The fund's custody fee may be reduced according to an arrangement that measures the value of cash deposited with the custodian by the fund. This amount, for the year ended November 30, 2008, is shown as a reduction of total expenses on the Statement of Operations.

Tax Matters and Distributions The fund intends to qualify as a regulated investment company, as defined under Subchapter M of the Internal Revenue Code, and to distribute all of its taxable and tax-exempt income, including realized capital gains. As a result, no provision for federal income taxes is required. The fund adopted the provisions of FASB Interpretation No. 48, Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes (the Interpretation) on the first day of the fund's fiscal year. The Interpretation prescribes a minimum threshold for financial statement recognition of the benefit of a tax position taken or expected to be taken in a tax return. There was no impact resulting from the adoption of this Interpretation on the fund's financial statements. Each of the fund's federal tax returns for the prior three fiscal years remains subject to examination by the Internal Revenue Service.

Distributions to shareholders are recorded on the ex-dividend date. Income and capital gain distributions are determined in accordance with income tax regulations, which may differ from U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. Certain capital accounts in the financial statements are periodically adjusted for permanent differences in order to reflect their tax character. These adjustments have no impact on net assets or net asset value per share. Temporary differences which arise from recognizing certain items of income, expense, gain or loss in different periods for financial statement and tax purposes will reverse at some time in the future. Distributions in excess of net investment income or net realized gains are temporary

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

overdistributions for financial statement purposes resulting from differences in the recognition or classification of income or distributions for financial statement and tax purposes.

Book/tax differences primarily relate to expiration of capital loss carryforwards, amortization and accretion of debt securities, defaulted bonds, and derivative transactions.

The tax character of distributions declared to shareholders for the last two fiscal years is as follows:

	11/30/08	11/30/07
Ordinary income (including any short-term capital gains)	\$	\$12,385
Tax-exempt income	8,361,822	8,560,956
Total distributions	\$8,361,822	\$8,573,341

The federal tax cost and the tax basis components of distributable earnings were as follows:

As of 11/30/08

Cost of investments	\$154,144,782
Gross appreciation	3,500,857
Gross depreciation	(21,075,432)
Net unrealized appreciation (depreciation)	\$(17,574,575)
Undistributed ordinary income	249,596
Undistributed tax-exempt income	10,240
Capital loss carryforwards	(14,745,830)
Post-October capital loss deferral	(3,726,305)
Other temporary differences	(109,818)

As of November 30, 2008, the fund had capital loss carryforwards available to offset future realized gains. Such losses expire as follows:

11/30/10	\$(1,238,884)
11/30/15	(7,005,145)
11/30/16	(6,501,801)
	\$(14,745,830)

(3) Transactions with Affiliates

Investment Adviser The fund has an investment advisory agreement with Massachusetts Financial Services Company (MFS) to provide overall investment management and related administrative services and facilities to the fund. The management fee is computed daily and paid monthly at an annual rate of 0.65% of the fund's average daily net assets (including the value of auction preferred shares).

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

The investment adviser has agreed in writing to reduce its management fee to 0.63% of average daily net assets (including the value of auction preferred shares). This written agreement will continue until modified by the fund's Board of Trustees, but such agreement will continue until at least November 30, 2009. This management fee reduction amounted to \$33,883, which is shown as a reduction of total expenses in the Statement of Operations. The management fee incurred for the year ended November 30, 2008 was equivalent to an annual effective rate of 0.63% of the fund's average daily net assets (including the value of auction preferred shares).

The investment adviser has agreed in writing to pay a portion of the fund's total annual operating expenses, exclusive of interest, taxes, extraordinary expenses, brokerage and transaction costs, and investment-related expenses other than remarketing fees, such that total annual fund operating expenses do not exceed 0.89% annually of the fund's average daily net assets (including the value of auction preferred shares). This written agreement will continue until modified by the fund's Board of Trustees, but such agreement will continue until at least November 30, 2009. For the year ended November 30, 2008, this reduction amounted to \$68,500 and is reflected as a reduction of total expenses in the Statement of Operations.

Transfer Agent The fund engages Computershare Trust Company, N.A. (Computershare) as the sole transfer agent for the fund's common shares. MFS Service Center, Inc. (MFSC) monitors and supervises the activities of Computershare for an agreed upon fee approved by the Board of Trustees. For the year ended November 30, 2008, these fees paid to MFSC amounted to \$10,221. MFSC also receives payment from the fund for out-of-pocket expenses paid by MFSC on behalf of the fund. For the year ended November 30, 2008, the fund did not pay any out-of-pocket expenses to MFSC.

Administrator MFS provides certain financial, legal, shareholder communications, compliance, and other administrative services to the fund. Under an administrative services agreement, the fund partially reimburses MFS the costs incurred to provide these services. The fund is charged a fixed amount plus a fee based on average daily net assets. The fund's annual fixed amount is \$17,500.

The administrative services fee incurred for the year ended November 30, 2008 was equivalent to an annual effective rate of 0.0200% of the fund's average daily net assets (including the value of auction preferred shares).

Trustees and Officers Compensation The fund pays compensation to independent trustees in the form of a retainer, attendance fees, and additional compensation to Board and Committee chairpersons. The fund does not pay compensation directly to trustees or to officers of the fund who are also officers of the investment adviser, all of whom receive remuneration for their

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

services to the fund from MFS. Certain officers and trustees of the fund are officers or directors of MFS and MFSC.

Deferred Trustee Compensation Under a Deferred Compensation Plan (the Plan) independent trustees previously were allowed to elect to defer receipt of all or a portion of their annual compensation. Trustees are no longer allowed to defer compensation under the Plan. Amounts previously deferred are treated as though equivalent dollar amounts had been invested in shares of certain MFS funds selected by the trustee. Deferred amounts represent an unsecured obligation of the fund until distributed in accordance with the Plan. Included in other assets and payable for independent trustees' compensation is \$14,618 of deferred trustees' compensation.

Other This fund and certain other MFS funds (the funds) have entered into services agreements (the Agreements) which provide for payment of fees by the funds to Tarantino LLC and Griffin Compliance LLC in return for the provision of services of an Independent Chief Compliance Officer (ICCO) and Assistant ICCO, respectively, for the funds. The ICCO and Assistant ICCO are officers of the funds and the sole members of Tarantino LLC and Griffin Compliance LLC, respectively. The funds can terminate the Agreements with Tarantino LLC and Griffin Compliance LLC at any time under the terms of the Agreements. For the year ended November 30, 2008, the aggregate fees paid by the fund to Tarantino LLC and Griffin Compliance LLC were \$927 and are included in miscellaneous expense on the Statement of Operations. MFS has agreed to reimburse the fund for a portion of the payments made by the fund in the amount of \$547, which is shown as a reduction of total expenses in the Statement of Operations. Additionally, MFS has agreed to bear all expenses associated with office space, other administrative support, and supplies provided to the ICCO and Assistant ICCO.

(4) Portfolio Securities

Purchases and sales of investments, other than U.S. Government securities, purchased option transactions, and short-term obligations, aggregated \$57,245,737 and \$64,642,151, respectively.

(5) Shares of Beneficial Interest

The fund's Declaration of Trust permits the Trustees to issue an unlimited number of full and fractional shares of beneficial interest. The fund reserves the right to repurchase shares of beneficial interest of the fund subject to Trustee approval. During the year ended November 30, 2008, the fund did not repurchase any shares.

(6) Line of Credit

The fund and other funds managed by MFS participate in a \$1 billion unsecured committed line of credit provided by a syndication of banks under a credit agreement. In addition, the fund and other funds managed by MFS have

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

established uncommitted borrowing arrangements with certain banks. Borrowings may be made for temporary financing needs. Interest is charged to each fund, based on its borrowings, generally at a rate equal to the Federal Reserve funds rate plus 0.30%. In addition, a commitment fee, based on the average daily, unused portion of the committed line of credit, is allocated among the participating funds at the end of each calendar quarter. For the year ended November 30, 2008, the fund's commitment fee and interest expense on the line of credit were \$258 and \$0, respectively, and are included in miscellaneous expense and interest expense and fees, respectively, on the Statement of Operations.

(7) Auction Preferred Shares

The fund issued 2,400 shares of Auction Preferred Shares (APS); at November 30, 2008, 1,950 shares are outstanding. Dividends are cumulative at a rate that is reset every seven days through an auction process. If the APS are unable to be remarketed on a remarketing date as part of the auction process, the fund would be required to pay the maximum applicable rate on APS to holders of such shares for successive dividend periods until such time when the shares are successfully remarketed. The maximum rate on APS is equal to 110% of the higher of (i) the Taxable Equivalent of the Short-Term Municipal Bond Rate or (ii) the AA Composite Commercial Paper Rate.

Since February 2008, regularly scheduled auctions for APS issued by closed end funds, including MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust, have consistently failed because of insufficient demand (bids to buy shares) to meet the supply (shares offered for sale) at each auction. In a failed auction, APS holders cannot sell their shares tendered for sale. While repeated auction failures have affected the liquidity for APS, they do not constitute a default or automatically alter the credit quality of the APS, and APS holders have continued to receive dividends at the previously defined maximum rate. During the year ended November 30, 2008, the APS dividend rates ranged from 1.61% to 11.35%. For the year ended November 30, 2008, the average dividend rate was 3.69%. These developments with respect to APS do not affect the management or investment policies of the fund. However, one implication of these auction failures for Common shareholders is that the fund's cost of leverage will be higher than it otherwise would have been had the auctions continued to be successful. As a result, the fund's future Common share earnings may be lower than they otherwise would have been. To the extent that investments are purchased with the issuance of preferred shares, the fund's net asset value will increase or decrease at a greater rate than a comparable unleveraged fund.

On August 22, 2008, the fund redeemed 450 shares of APS at a price of \$25,000 per share plus any accrued and unpaid dividends through the redemption date,

Table of Contents

Notes to Financial Statements continued

for the aggregate price of \$11,250,000. The fund financed the APS redemptions through the creation of tender option bonds, whereby the fund transferred highly rated fixed rate municipal bonds held in its portfolio to a special purpose trust that issued floating rate certificates and inverse floating rate certificates. The fund held the inverse floating rate certificates and used the proceeds from the sale of the floating rate certificates to redeem a portion of the APS.

The fund pays an annual fee equivalent to 0.25% of the preferred share liquidation value for remarketing efforts associated with the preferred auction. The APS are redeemable at the option of the fund in whole or in part at the redemption price equal to \$25,000 per share, plus accumulated and unpaid dividends. The APS are also subject to mandatory redemption if certain requirements relating to its asset maintenance coverage are not satisfied. The fund is required to maintain certain asset coverage with respect to the APS as defined in the fund's By-Laws and the Investment Company Act of 1940 and, as such is not permitted to declare common share dividends unless the fund's APS have a minimum asset coverage ratio of 200% after declaration of the common share dividends.

Table of Contents

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Trustees and Shareholders of MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust:

We have audited the accompanying statement of assets and liabilities of MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust (the Fund), including the portfolio of investments, as of November 30, 2008, and the related statement of operations for the year then ended, and the statements of changes in net assets and the financial highlights for each of the two years in the period then ended. These financial statements and financial highlights are the responsibility of the Fund's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements and financial highlights based on our audits. The financial highlights for each of the three years in the period ended November 30, 2006 were audited by another independent registered public accounting firm whose report, dated January 25, 2007, expressed an unqualified opinion on those financial highlights.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements and financial highlights are free of material misstatement. We were not engaged to perform an audit of the Fund's internal control over financial reporting. Our audits included consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Fund's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements and financial highlights, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, and evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. Our procedures included confirmation of securities owned as of November 30, 2008 by correspondence with the fund's custodian and brokers. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements and financial highlights referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust at November 30, 2008, the results of its operations for the year then ended, and the changes in its net assets and the financial highlights for each of the two years in the period then ended, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Boston, Massachusetts

January 20, 2009

Table of Contents**RESULTS OF SHAREHOLDER MEETING**

(unaudited)

At the annual meeting of shareholders of MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust, which was held on October 9, 2008, the following actions were taken:

Item 1. To elect the following individuals as Trustees elected by the holders of common shares and preferred shares together:

Nominee	Number of Shares	
	Affirmative	Abstain
William R. Gutow	9,614,590.13	461,687.85
Michael Hegarty	9,644,044.31	432,233.68
Robert W. Uek	9,632,821.65	443,456.34

Item 2. To elect the following individuals as Trustees elected by the holders of preferred shares only:

Nominee	Number of Shares	
	Affirmative	Abstain
William R. Gutow	2,317	83
Michael Hegarty	2,317	83
Robert W. Uek	2,317	83
J. Atwood Ives	2,317	83
Laurie J. Thomsen	2,317	83

Item 3. To approve an amended and restated Declaration of Trust as further described in the proxy statement:

	Number of Common Shares	Number of Preferred Shares
For	6,106,400.09	2,165.27
Against	253,688.90	184.80
Abstain	308,755.99	49.93

Item 4. To amend or remove certain fundamental investment policies as further described in the proxy statement:

	Number of Common Shares	Number of Preferred Shares
For	5,992,906.99	2,190.09
Against	332,585.89	157.40
Abstain	343,352.10	52.51

Table of Contents

TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS IDENTIFICATION AND BACKGROUND

The Trustees and officers of the Trust, as of January 1, 2009, are listed below, together with their principal occupations during the past five years. (Their titles may have varied during that period.) The address of each Trustee and officer is 500 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116.

Name, Date of Birth	Position(s) Held with Fund	Trustee/Officer Since (h)	Principal Occupations During the Past Five Years & Other Directorships (j)
INTERESTED TRUSTEES			
Robert J. Manning (k) (born 10/20/63)	Trustee	February 2004	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Chief Executive Officer, President, Chief Investment Officer and Director
Robert C. Pozen (k) (born 8/08/46)	Trustee	February 2004	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Chairman (since February 2004); Harvard Business School (education), Senior Lecturer (since 2008); Bell Canada Enterprises (telecommunications), Director (since March 2002); The Bank of New York, Director (finance), (March 2004 to May 2005); The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Secretary of Economic Affairs (January 2002 to December 2002); Fidelity Investments, (investment advisor), Vice Chairman (until December 2001); Fidelity Management & Research Company (investment adviser), President (until July 2001); Telesat (satellite communications), Director (until November 2007)
INDEPENDENT TRUSTEES			
David H. Gunning (born 5/30/42)	Trustee and Chair of Trustees	January 2004	Retired; Cleveland-Cliffs Inc. (mining products and service provider), Vice Chairman/Director (until May 2007); Lincoln Electric Holdings, Inc. (welding equipment manufacturer), Director; Development Alternatives, Inc. (consulting), Director/Non Executive Chairman; Portman Limited (mining), Director (since 2005); Southwest Gas Corp. (natural gas distribution), Director (until May 2004)

Table of Contents*Trustees and Officers continued*

Name, Date of Birth	Position(s) Held with Fund	Trustee/Officer Since (h)	Principal Occupations During the Past Five Years & Other Directorships (j)
Robert E. Butler (n) (born 11/29/41)	Trustee	January 2006	Consultant – regulatory and compliance matters (since July 2002); PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (professional services firm), Partner (until 2002)
Lawrence H. Cohn, M.D. (born 3/11/37)	Trustee	August 1993	Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Senior Cardiac Surgeon (since 2005); Harvard Medical School, Professor of Cardiac Surgery; Partners HealthCare, Physician Director of Medical Device Technology (since 2006); Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Chief of Cardiac Surgery (until 2005)
Maureen R. Goldfarb (born 4/06/55)	Trustee	January 2009	Private investor; John Hancock Financial Services, Inc., Executive Vice President (until 2004); John Hancock Mutual Funds, Trustee and Chief Executive Officer (until 2004)
William R. Gutow (born 9/27/41)	Trustee	December 1993	Private investor and real estate consultant; Capital Entertainment Management Company (video franchise), Vice Chairman; Texas Donuts (donut franchise), Vice Chairman (since 2007); Atlantic Coast Tan (tanning salons), Vice Chairman (until 2007)
Michael Hegarty (born 12/21/44)	Trustee	December 2004	Retired; AXA Financial (financial services and insurance), Vice Chairman and Chief Operating Officer (until 2001); The Equitable Life Assurance Society (insurance), President and Chief Operating Officer (until 2001)
J. Atwood Ives (born 5/01/36)	Trustee	February 1992	Private investor; KeySpan Corporation (energy related services), Director until 2004; Woodstock Corporation (investment advisory firm), Director until 2003

Table of Contents*Trustees and Officers continued*

Name, Date of Birth	Position(s) Held with Fund	Trustee/Officer Since (h)	Principal Occupations During the Past Five Years & Other Directorships (j)
John P. Kavanaugh (born 11/04/54)	Trustee	January 2009	Private investor; The Hanover Insurance Group, Inc., Vice President and Chief Investment Officer (until 2006); Allmerica Investment Trust, Allmerica Securities Trust and Opus Investment Trust (investment companies), Chairman, President and Trustee (until 2006)
J. Dale Sherratt (born 9/23/38)	Trustee	August 1993	Insight Resources, Inc. (acquisition planning specialists), President; Wellfleet Investments (investor in health care companies), Managing General Partner
Laurie J. Thomsen (born 8/05/57)	Trustee	March 2005	New Profit, Inc. (venture philanthropy), Partner (since 2006); Private investor; Prism Venture Partners (venture capital), Co-founder and General Partner (until June 2004); The Travelers Companies (commercial property liability insurance), Director
Robert W. Uek (born 5/18/41)	Trustee	January 2006	Consultant to investment company industry; PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (professional services firm), Partner (until 1999); TT International Funds (mutual fund complex), Trustee (until 2005); Hillview Investment Trust II Funds (mutual fund complex), Trustee (until 2005)
OFFICERS			
Maria F. Dwyer (k) (born 12/01/58)	President	November 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Executive Vice President and Chief Regulatory Officer (since March 2004) Chief Compliance Officer (since December 2006); Fidelity Management & Research Company, Vice President (prior to March 2004); Fidelity Group of Funds, President and Treasurer (until March 2004)

Table of Contents*Trustees and Officers continued*

Name, Date of Birth	Position(s) Held with Fund	Trustee/Officer Since (h)	Principal Occupations During the Past Five Years & Other Directorships (j)
Christopher R. Bohane (k) (born 1/18/74)	Assistant Secretary and Assistant Clerk	July 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Vice President and Senior Counsel
John M. Corcoran (k) (born 4/13/65)	Treasurer	October 2008	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Senior Vice President (since October 2008); State Street Bank and Trust (financial services provider), Senior Vice President, (until September 2008)
Ethan D. Corey (k) (born 11/21/63)	Assistant Secretary and Assistant Clerk	July 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Senior Vice President and Associate General Counsel (since 2004); Dechert LLP (law firm), Counsel (prior to December 2004)
David L. DiLorenzo (k) (born 8/10/68)	Assistant Treasurer	July 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Vice President (since June 2005); JP Morgan Investor Services, Vice President (until June 2005)
Timothy M. Fagan (k) (born 7/10/68)	Assistant Secretary and Assistant Clerk	September 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Vice President and Senior Counsel (since September 2005); John Hancock Advisers, LLC, Vice President, Senior Attorney and Chief Compliance Officer (until August 2005)
Mark D. Fischer (k) (born 10/27/70)	Assistant Treasurer	July 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Vice President (since May 2005); JP Morgan Investment Management Company, Vice President (until May 2005)
Robyn L. Griffin (born 7/04/75)	Assistant Independent Chief Compliance Officer	August 2008	Griffin Compliance LLC (provider of compliance services), Principal (since August 2008); State Street Corporation (financial services provider), Mutual Fund Administration Assistant Vice President (October 2006 – July 2008); Liberty Mutual Group (insurance), Personal Market Assistant Controller (April 2006 – October 2006); Deloitte & Touche LLP (professional services firm), Senior Manager (prior to April 2006)

Table of Contents*Trustees and Officers continued*

Name, Date of Birth	Position(s) Held with Fund	Trustee/Officer Since (h)	Principal Occupations During the Past Five Years & Other Directorships (j)
Brian E. Langenfeld (k) (born 3/07/73)	Assistant Secretary and Assistant Clerk	June 2006	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Vice President and Senior Counsel (since May 2006); John Hancock Advisers, LLC, Assistant Vice President and Counsel (until April 2006)
Ellen Moynihan (k) (born 11/13/57)	Assistant Treasurer	April 1997	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Senior Vice President
Susan S. Newton (k) (born 3/07/50)	Assistant Secretary and Assistant Clerk	May 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Senior Vice President and Associate General Counsel (since April 2005); John Hancock Advisers, LLC, Senior Vice President, Secretary and Chief Legal Officer (until April 2005)
Susan A. Pereira (k) (born 11/05/70)	Assistant Secretary and Assistant Clerk	July 2005	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Vice President and Senior Counsel (since June 2004); Bingham McCutchen LLP (law firm), Associate (until June 2004)
Mark N. Polebaum (k) (born 5/01/52)	Secretary and Clerk	January 2006	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary (since January 2006); Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP (law firm), Partner (until January 2006)
Frank L. Tarantino (born 3/07/44)	Independent Chief Compliance Officer	June 2004	Tarantino LLC (provider of compliance services), Principal (since June 2004); CRA Business Strategies Group (consulting services), Executive Vice President (until June 2004)
Richard S. Weitzel (k) (born 7/16/70)	Assistant Secretary and Assistant Clerk	October 2007	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Vice President and Assistant General Counsel (since 2004); Massachusetts Department of Business and Technology, General Counsel (until April 2004)
James O. Yost (k) (born 6/12/60)	Assistant Treasurer	September 1990	Massachusetts Financial Services Company, Senior Vice President

(h) Date first appointed to serve as Trustee/officer of an MFS fund. Each Trustee has served continuously since appointment unless indicated otherwise. For the period from December 15, 2004 until February 22, 2005, Messrs. Pozen and Manning served as Advisory Trustees. For the period March 2008 until October 2008, Ms. Dwyer served as Treasurer of the Funds.

Table of Contents

Trustees and Officers continued

- (j) Directorships or trusteeships of companies required to report to the Securities and Exchange Commission (i.e., public companies).
- (k) Interested person of the Trust within the meaning of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (referred to as the 1940 Act), which is the principal federal law governing investment companies like the fund, as a result of position with MFS. The address of MFS is 500 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116.
- (n) In 2004 and 2005, Mr. Butler provided consulting services to the independent compliance consultant retained by MFS pursuant to its settlement with the SEC concerning market timing and related matters. The terms of that settlement required that compensation and expenses related to the independent compliance consultant be borne exclusively by MFS and, therefore, MFS paid Mr. Butler for the services he rendered to the independent compliance consultant. In 2004 and 2005, MFS paid Mr. Butler a total of \$351,119.29.

The Trust holds annual shareholder meetings for the purpose of electing Trustees, and Trustees are elected for fixed terms. The Board of Trustees is currently divided into three classes, each having a term of three years which term expires on the date of the third annual meeting following the election to office of the Trustee's class. Each year the term of one class expires. Two Trustees, each holding a term of one year, are elected annually by holders of the Trust's preferred shares. Each Trustee and officer will serve until next elected or his or her earlier death, resignation, retirement or removal.

Messrs. Butler, Kavanaugh, Sherratt and Uek and Ms. Thomsen are members of the Fund's Audit Committee.

Each of the Fund's Trustees and officers holds comparable positions with certain other funds of which MFS or a subsidiary is the investment adviser or distributor, and, in the case of the officers, with certain affiliates of MFS. As of January 1, 2009, the Trustees served as board members of 105 funds within the MFS Family of Funds.

The Statement of Additional Information for the Fund and further information about the Trustees are available without charge upon request by calling 1-800-225-2606.

On November 5, 2008, Maria F. Dwyer, as President and Chief Executive Officer of the Trust, certified to the New York Stock Exchange that as of the date of her certification she was not aware of any violation by the Trust of the corporate governance listing standards of the New York Stock Exchange.

The Fund filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission the certifications of its principal executive officer and principal financial officer under Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2003 as an exhibit to the Fund's Form N-CSR for the period covered by this report.

Investment Adviser

Massachusetts Financial Services Company
500 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02116-3741

Portfolio Managers

Michael Dawson
Geoffrey Schechter

Custodian

State Street Bank and Trust Company
225 Franklin Street, Boston, MA 02110

Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

Ernst & Young LLP
200 Clarendon Street, Boston, MA 02116

Table of Contents

BOARD REVIEW OF INVESTMENT ADVISORY AGREEMENT

The Investment Company Act of 1940 requires that both the full Board of Trustees and a majority of the non-interested (independent) Trustees, voting separately, annually approve the continuation of the Fund s investment advisory agreement with MFS. The Trustees consider matters bearing on the Fund and its advisory arrangements at their meetings throughout the year, including a review of performance data at each regular meeting. In addition, the independent Trustees met several times over the course of three months beginning in May and ending in July, 2008 (contract review meetings) for the specific purpose of considering whether to approve the continuation of the investment advisory agreement for the Fund and the other investment companies that the Board oversees (the MFS Funds). The independent Trustees were assisted in their evaluation of the Fund s investment advisory agreement by independent legal counsel, from whom they received separate legal advice and with whom they met separately from MFS during various contract review meetings. The independent Trustees were also assisted in this process by the MFS Funds Independent Chief Compliance Officer, a full-time senior officer appointed by and reporting to the independent Trustees.

In June 2007, shareholders approved an investment advisory agreement between the Fund and MFS. Effective June 30, 2007, in connection with the consummation of the asset purchase agreement between MFS and Columbia Management Advisors LLC, MFS assumed investment management responsibilities for the Fund.

In connection with their deliberations regarding the continuation of the investment advisory agreement, the Trustees, including the independent Trustees, considered such information and factors as they believed, in light of the legal advice furnished to them and their own business judgment, to be relevant. The investment advisory agreement for the Fund was considered separately, although the Trustees also took into account the common interests of all MFS Funds in their review. As described below, the Trustees considered the nature, quality, and extent of the various investment advisory, administrative, and shareholder services performed by MFS under the existing investment advisory agreement and other arrangements with the Fund.

In connection with their contract review meetings, the Trustees received and relied upon materials that included, among other items: (i) information provided by Lipper Inc., an independent third party, on the investment performance (based on net asset value) of the Fund for various time periods ended December 31, 2007 and the investment performance (based on net asset value) of a group of funds with substantially similar investment classifications/objectives (the Lipper performance universe), (ii) information provided by

Table of Contents

Board Review of Investment Advisory Agreement continued

Lipper Inc. on the Fund's advisory fees and other expenses and the advisory fees and other expenses of comparable funds identified by Lipper Inc. (the "Lipper expense group"), (iii) information provided by MFS on the advisory fees of comparable portfolios of other clients of MFS, including institutional separate accounts and other clients, (iv) information as to whether and to what extent applicable expense waivers, reimbursements or fee breakpoints are observed for the Fund, (v) information regarding MFS' financial results and financial condition, including MFS' and certain of its affiliates' estimated profitability from services performed for the Fund and the MFS Funds as a whole, (vi) MFS' views regarding the outlook for the mutual fund industry and the strategic business plans of MFS, (vii) descriptions of various functions performed by MFS for the Funds, such as compliance monitoring and portfolio trading practices, and (viii) information regarding the overall organization of MFS, including information about MFS' senior management and other personnel providing investment advisory, administrative and other services to the Fund and the other MFS Funds. The comparative performance, fee and expense information prepared and provided by Lipper Inc. was not independently verified and the independent Trustees did not independently verify any information provided to them by MFS.

The Trustees' conclusion as to the continuation of the investment advisory agreement was based on a comprehensive consideration of all information provided to the Trustees and not the result of any single factor. Some of the factors that figured particularly in the Trustees' deliberations are described below, although individual Trustees may have evaluated the information presented differently from one another, giving different weights to various factors. It is also important to recognize that the fee arrangements for the Fund and other MFS Funds are the result of years of review and discussion between the independent Trustees and MFS, that certain aspects of such arrangements may receive greater scrutiny in some years than in others, and that the Trustees' conclusions may be based, in part, on their consideration of these same arrangements during the course of the year and in prior years.

Based on information provided by Lipper Inc., the Trustees reviewed the Fund's total return investment performance as well as the performance of peer groups of funds over various time periods. The Trustees placed particular emphasis on the total return performance of the Fund's common shares in comparison to the performance of funds in its Lipper performance universe over the three-year period ended December 31, 2007, which the Trustees believed was a long enough period to reflect differing market conditions. The total return performance of the Fund's common shares ranked 48th out of a total of 55 funds in the Lipper performance universe for this three-year period (a ranking of first place out of the total number of funds in the performance

Table of Contents

Board Review of Investment Advisory Agreement continued

universe indicating the best performer and a ranking of last place out of the total number of funds in the performance universe indicating the worst performer). The total return performance of the Fund's common shares ranked 49th out of a total of 55 funds for the one-year period and 46th out of a total of 54 funds for the five-year period ended December 31, 2007. Given the size of the Lipper performance universe and information previously provided by MFS regarding differences between the Fund and other funds in its Lipper performance universe, the Trustees also reviewed the Fund's performance in comparison to the Lehman Brothers Municipal Bond Index. The Fund under-performed the Lehman Brothers Municipal Bond Index for each of the one- and three-year periods ended December 31, 2007 (one-year: -4.00% total return for the Fund versus 3.36% total return for the benchmark; three-year: 2.94% total return for the Fund versus 3.91% total return for the benchmark), and out-performed the Lehman Brothers Municipal Bond Index for the five-year period ended December 31, 2007 (4.39% total return for the Fund versus 4.30% for the benchmark). Because of the passage of time, these performance results are likely to differ from the performance results for more recent periods, including those shown elsewhere in this report.

The Trustees expressed concern to MFS about the substandard investment performance of the Fund. In the course of their deliberations, the Trustees took into account information provided by MFS in connection with the contract review meetings, as well as during investment review meetings conducted with portfolio management personnel during the course of the year as to MFS' efforts to improve the Fund's performance, including that MFS became the Fund's investment advisor in June 2007. After reviewing these and related factors, the Trustees concluded, within the context of their overall conclusions regarding the investment advisory agreement, that MFS' responses and efforts and plans to improve investment performance were sufficient to support approval of the continuance of the investment advisory agreement for an additional one-year period, but that they would continue to closely monitor the performance of the Fund.

In assessing the reasonableness of the Fund's advisory fee, the Trustees considered, among other information, the Fund's advisory fee and the total expense ratio of the Fund's common shares as a percentage of average daily net assets and the advisory fee and total expense ratios of peer groups of funds based on information provided by Lipper Inc. The Trustees considered that MFS has agreed to waive a portion of its advisory fee, which may not be changed without the Trustees' approval, and that MFS currently observes an expense limitation for the Fund. The Trustees also considered that, according to the Lipper data, the Fund's effective advisory fee rate and total expense ratio were each higher than the Lipper expense group median.

Table of Contents

Board Review of Investment Advisory Agreement continued

The Trustees also considered the advisory fees charged by MFS to institutional accounts. In comparing these fees, the Trustees considered information provided by MFS as to the generally broader scope of services provided by MFS to the Fund in comparison to institutional accounts and the impact on MFS and expenses associated with the more extensive regulatory regime to which the Fund is subject in comparison to institutional accounts.

The Trustees considered that, as a closed-end fund, the Fund is unlikely to experience meaningful asset growth. As a result, the Trustees did not view the potential for realization of economies of scale as the Fund's assets grow to be a material factor in their deliberations. The Trustees noted that they would consider economies of scale in the future in the event the Fund experiences significant asset growth, such as through a material increase in the market value of the Fund's portfolio securities.

The Trustees also considered information prepared by MFS relating to MFS's costs and profits with respect to the Fund, the MFS Funds considered as a group, and other investment companies and accounts advised by MFS, as well as MFS's methodologies used to determine and allocate its costs to the MFS Funds, the Fund and other accounts and products for purposes of estimating profitability.

After reviewing these and other factors described herein, the Trustees concluded, within the context of their overall conclusions regarding the investment advisory agreement, that the advisory fees charged to the Fund represent reasonable compensation in light of the services being provided by MFS to the Fund.

In addition, the Trustees considered MFS's resources and related efforts to continue to retain, attract and motivate capable personnel to serve the Fund. The Trustees also considered current and developing conditions in the financial services industry, including the entry into the industry of large and well-capitalized companies which are spending, and appear to be prepared to continue to spend, substantial sums to engage personnel and to provide services to competing investment companies. In this regard, the Trustees also considered the financial resources of MFS and its ultimate parent, Sun Life Financial Inc. The Trustees also considered the advantages and possible disadvantages to the Fund of having an adviser that also serves other investment companies as well as other accounts.

The Trustees also considered the nature, quality, cost, and extent of administrative services provided to the Fund by MFS under agreements other than the investment advisory agreement. The Trustees also considered the nature, extent and quality of certain other services MFS performs or arranges for on the Fund's behalf, which may include securities lending programs, directed expense payment programs, class action recovery programs, and MFS's interaction with third-party service providers, principally custodians and

Table of Contents

Board Review of Investment Advisory Agreement continued

sub-custodians. The Trustees concluded that the various non-advisory services provided by MFS and its affiliates on behalf of the Funds were satisfactory.

The Trustees also considered benefits to MFS from the use of the Fund's portfolio brokerage commissions, if applicable, to pay for investment research (excluding third-party research, for which MFS pays directly) and various other factors. Additionally, the Trustees considered so-called fall-out benefits to MFS such as reputational value derived from serving as investment manager to the Fund.

Based on their evaluation of factors that they deemed to be material, including those factors described above, the Board of Trustees, including a majority of the independent Trustees, concluded that the Fund's investment advisory agreement with MFS should be continued for an additional one-year period, commencing August 1, 2008.

A discussion regarding the Board's most recent review and renewal of the fund's Investment Advisory Agreement with MFS is available by clicking on the fund's name under "Closed End Funds" in the "Products and Performance" section on the MFS Web site (mfs.com).

Table of Contents

PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND INFORMATION

A general description of the MFS funds' proxy voting policies and procedures is available without charge, upon request, by calling 1-800-225-2606, by visiting the Proxy Voting section of *mfs.com* or by visiting the SEC's Web site at <http://www.sec.gov>.

Information regarding how the fund voted proxies relating to portfolio securities during the most recent twelve-month period ended June 30 is available without charge by visiting the Proxy Voting section of *mfs.com* or by visiting the SEC's Web site at <http://www.sec.gov>.

QUARTERLY PORTFOLIO DISCLOSURE

The fund will file a complete schedule of portfolio holdings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the Commission) for the first and third quarters of each fiscal year on Form N-Q. The fund's Form N-Q may be reviewed and copied at the:

Public Reference Room

Securities and Exchange Commission

100 F Street, NE, Room 1580

Washington, D.C. 20549

Information on the operation of the Public Reference Room may be obtained by calling the Commission at 1.800.SEC.0330. The fund's Form N-Q is available on the EDGAR database on the Commission's Internet Web site at <http://www.sec.gov>, and copies of this information may be obtained, upon payment of a duplicating fee, by electronic request at the following e-mail address: publicinfo@sec.gov or by writing the Public Reference Section at the above address.

A shareholder can also obtain the quarterly portfolio holdings report at *mfs.com*.

FEDERAL TAX INFORMATION (unaudited)

The fund will notify shareholders of amounts for use in preparing 2008 income tax forms in January 2009. The following information is provided pursuant to provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Of the dividends paid from net investment income during the fiscal year, 100% is designated as exempt interest dividends for federal income tax purposes. If the fund has earned income on private activity bonds, a portion of the dividends paid may be considered a tax preference item for purposes of computing a shareholder's alternative minimum tax.

Table of Contents

MFS® PRIVACY NOTICE

Privacy is a concern for every investor today. At MFS Investment Management® and the MFS funds, we take this concern very seriously. We want you to understand our policies about the investment products and services that we offer, and how we protect the nonpublic personal information of investors who have a direct relationship with us and our wholly owned subsidiaries.

Throughout our business relationship, you provide us with personal information. We maintain information and records about you, your investments, and the services you use. Examples of the nonpublic personal information we maintain include

- data from investment applications and other forms
- share balances and transactional history with us, our affiliates, or others
- facts from a consumer reporting agency

We do not disclose any nonpublic personal information about our customers or former customers to anyone, except as permitted by law. We may share nonpublic personal information with third parties or certain of our affiliates in connection with servicing your account or processing your transactions. We may share information with companies or financial institutions that perform marketing services on our behalf or with other financial institutions with which we have joint marketing arrangements, subject to any legal requirements.

Authorization to access your nonpublic personal information is limited to appropriate personnel who provide products, services, or information to you. We maintain physical, electronic, and procedural safeguards to help protect the personal information we collect about you.

If you have any questions about the MFS privacy policy, please call 1-800-225-2606 any business day between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. Eastern time.

Note: If you own MFS products or receive MFS services in the name of a third party such as a bank or broker-dealer, their privacy policy may apply to you instead of ours.

Table of Contents

CONTACT INFORMATION

Investor Information

Transfer Agent, Registrar and Dividend Disbursing Agent

Call 1-800-637-2304 any business day from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Eastern time

Write to: Computershare Trust Company, N.A.

P.O. Box 43078

Providence, RI 02940-3078

500 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02116

Table of Contents**ITEM 2. CODE OF ETHICS.**

The Registrant has adopted a Code of Ethics pursuant to Section 406 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and as defined in Form N-CSR that applies to the Registrant's principal executive officer and principal financial and accounting officer. The Registrant has not amended any provision in its Code of Ethics (the Code) that relates to an element of the Code's definitions enumerated in paragraph (b) of Item 2 of this Form N-CSR.

ITEM 3. AUDIT COMMITTEE FINANCIAL EXPERT.

Messrs. Robert E. Butler, John P. Kavanaugh and Robert W. Uek and Ms. Laurie J. Thomsen, members of the Audit Committee, have been determined by the Board of Trustees in their reasonable business judgment to meet the definition of audit committee financial expert as such term is defined in Form N-CSR. In addition, Messrs. Butler, and Uek and Ms. Thomsen are independent members of the Audit Committee (as such term has been defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission in regulations implementing Section 407 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002). The Securities and Exchange Commission has stated that the designation of a person as an audit committee financial expert pursuant to this Item 3 on the Form N-CSR does not impose on such a person any duties, obligations or liability that are greater than the duties, obligations or liability imposed on such person as a member of the Audit Committee and the Board of Trustees in the absence of such designation or identification.

ITEM 4. PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTANT FEES AND SERVICES.**Items 4(a) through 4(d) and 4(g):**

Prior to June 29, 2007, the Board of Trustees had appointed PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC) to serve as independent accountants to the Registrant (hereinafter the Registrant or the Fund). The tables below set forth the audit fees billed to the Fund as well as fees for non-audit services provided to the Fund and/or to the Fund's former investment adviser, Columbia Management Advisors, LLC (Columbia), and to various entities either controlling, controlled by, or under common control with Columbia that provide ongoing services to the Fund (Columbia Related Entities). On June 29, 2007, the Board of Trustees appointed Ernst & Young LLP (E&Y) to serve as independent accountants to the Registrant. The tables below set forth the audit fees billed to the Fund as well as fees for non-audit services provided to the Fund and/or to the Fund's investment adviser as of June 29, 2007, Massachusetts Financial Services Company (MFS), and to various entities either controlling, controlled by, or under common control with MFS that provide ongoing services to the Fund (MFS Related Entities).

For the fiscal years ended November 30, 2008 and 2007, audit fees billed to the Fund by PWC and E&Y, as the case may be, were as follows:

	Audit Fees	
	2008	2007
Fees billed by PWC:		
MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust	0	0
	2008	2007
Fees billed by E&Y:		
MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust	47,054	45,200

Table of Contents

For the fiscal years ended November 30, 2008 and 2007, fees billed by PWC for audit-related, tax and other services provided to the Fund and for audit-related, tax and other services provided to Columbia and Columbia Related Entities were as follows

	Audit-Related Fees ¹		Tax Fees ²		All Other Fees ³	
	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007
Fees billed by PWC:						
To MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust	0	5,600	0	3,500	0	0
To Columbia and Columbia Related Entities of MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust*	0	0	0	0	0	357,970

	2008	2007
Aggregate fees for non-audit services:		

To MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust, Columbia and Columbia Related Entities [#]	0	367,070
--	---	---------

For the fiscal years ended November 30, 2008 and 2007, billed by E&Y for audit-related, tax and other services provided to the Fund and for audit-related, tax and other services provided to MFS and MFS Related Entities were as follows:

	Audit-Related Fees ¹		Tax Fees ²		All Other Fees ³	
	2008	2007	2008	2007	2008	2007
Fees billed by E&Y:						
To MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust	10,000	0	8,849	8,550	0	0
To MFS and MFS Related Entities of MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust**	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table of Contents

	2008	2007
Aggregate fees for non-audit services:		
To MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust, MFS and MFS Related Entities ^{##}	230,266	123,959

- * This amount reflects the fees billed to Columbia and Columbia Related Entities for non-audit services relating directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Fund.
- # This amount reflects the aggregate fees billed by PWC for non-audit services rendered to the Fund and for non-audit services rendered to Columbia and the Columbia Related Entities.
- ** This amount reflects the fees billed to MFS and MFS Related Entities for non-audit services relating directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Fund (portions of which services also related to the operations and financial reporting of other funds within the MFS Funds complex).
- ## This amount reflects the aggregate fees billed by E&Y for non-audit services rendered to the Fund and for non-audit services rendered to MFS and the MFS Related Entities.
- ¹ The fees included under **Audit-Related Fees** are fees for products and services provided by PWC or E&Y related to assurance and related services that are reasonably related to the performance of the audit or review of financial statements, but not reported under **Audit Fees**, including accounting consultations, agreed-upon procedure reports, attestation reports, comfort letters, rating agency reviews, and internal control reviews.
- ² The fees included under **Tax Fees** are fees for products and services provided by PWC or E&Y associated with tax compliance, tax advice and tax planning, including services relating to the filing or amendment of federal, state or local income tax returns, regulated investment company qualification reviews and tax distribution and analysis.
- ³ The fees included under **All Other Fees** are fees for products and services provided by PWC or E&Y other than those reported under **Audit Fees**, **Audit-Related Fees** and **Tax Fees**, including fees for the subscription to tax treatise and for services related to analysis of fund administrative expenses, compliance program and records management projects.

Item 4(e)(1):

Set forth below are the policies and procedures established by the Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees on June 29, 2007 relating to the pre-approval of audit and non-audit related services:

To the extent required by applicable law, pre-approval by the Audit Committee of the Board is needed for all audit and permissible non-audit services rendered to the Fund and all permissible non-audit services rendered to MFS or MFS Related Entities if the services

Table of Contents

relate directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Registrant. Pre-approval is currently on an engagement-by-engagement basis. In the event pre-approval of such services is necessary between regular meetings of the Audit Committee and it is not practical to wait to seek pre-approval at the next regular meeting of the Audit Committee, pre-approval of such services may be referred to the Chair of the Audit Committee for approval; provided that the Chair may not pre-approve any individual engagement for such services exceeding \$50,000 or multiple engagements for such services in the aggregate exceeding \$100,000 between such regular meetings of the Audit Committee. Any engagement pre-approved by the Chair between regular meetings of the Audit Committee shall be presented for ratification by the entire Audit Committee at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Item 4(e)(2):

For any period covered by this Form N-CSR and prior to June 29, 2007, none or 0%, of the services relating to the Audit-Related Fees, Tax Fees and All Other Fees paid by the Fund and Columbia and Columbia Related Entities relating directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Registrant disclosed above were approved by the audit committee pursuant to paragraphs (c)(7)(i)(C) of Rule 2-01 of Regulation S-X (which permits audit committee approval after the start of the engagement with respect to services other than audit, review or attest services, if certain conditions are satisfied). For any period covered by this Form N-CSR on or after June 29, 2007, none, or 0%, of the services relating to the Audit-Related Fees, Tax Fees and All Other Fees paid by the Fund and MFS and MFS Related Entities relating directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Registrant disclosed above were approved by the audit committee pursuant to paragraphs (c)(7)(i)(C) of Rule 2-01 of Regulation S-X (which permits audit committee approval after the start of the engagement with respect to services other than audit, review or attest services, if certain conditions are satisfied).

Item 4(f): Not applicable.

Item 4(h): For any period covered by this Form N-CSR and prior to June 29, 2007, the Registrant's Audit Committee considered whether the provision by PWC of non-audit services to Columbia and Columbia Related Entities that were not pre-approved by the Committee (because such services were provided prior to the effectiveness of SEC rules requiring pre-approval or because such services did not relate directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Registrant) was compatible with maintaining the independence of PWC as the Registrant's principal auditors. For any period covered by this Form N-CSR on or after June 29, 2007, the Registrant's Audit Committee considered whether the provision by a E&Y of non-audit services to MFS and MFS Related Entities that were not pre-approved by the Committee (because such services were provided prior to the effectiveness of SEC rules requiring pre-approval or because such services did not relate directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Registrant) was compatible with maintaining the independence of the independent registered public accounting firm as the Registrant's principal auditors.

Table of Contents

ITEM 5. AUDIT COMMITTEE OF LISTED REGISTRANTS.

The Registrant has an Audit Committee established in accordance with Section 3(a)(58)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The members of the Audit Committee are Messrs. Robert E. Butler, John P. Kavanaugh, J. Dale Sherratt and Robert W. Uek and Ms. Laurie J. Thomsen.

ITEM 6. SCHEDULE OF INVESTMENTS

A schedule of investments of the Registrant is included as part of the report to shareholders of the Registrant under Item 1 of this Form N-CSR.

ITEM 7. DISCLOSURE OF PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CLOSED-END MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

MASSACHUSETTS FINANCIAL SERVICES COMPANY

PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

January 1, 2009

Massachusetts Financial Services Company, MFS Institutional Advisors, Inc., MFS International (UK) Limited, MFS Heritage Trust Company, and MFS other investment adviser subsidiaries (except Four Pillars Capital, Inc.) (collectively, "MFS") have adopted proxy voting policies and procedures, as set forth below ("MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures"), with respect to securities owned by the clients for which MFS serves as investment adviser and has the power to vote proxies, including the registered investment companies sponsored by MFS (the "MFS Funds"). References to "clients" in these policies and procedures include the MFS Funds and other clients of MFS, such as funds organized offshore, sub-advised funds and separate account clients, to the extent these clients have delegated to MFS the responsibility to vote proxies on their behalf under the MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures.

The MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures include:

- A. Voting Guidelines;
- B. Administrative Procedures;
- C. Monitoring System;
- D. Records Retention; and
- E. Reports.

Table of Contents

A. VOTING GUIDELINES

1. General Policy; Potential Conflicts of Interest

MFS policy is that proxy voting decisions are made in what MFS believes to be the best long-term economic interests of MFS clients, and not in the interests of any other party or in MFS corporate interests, including interests such as the distribution of MFS Fund shares, and institutional relationships.

In developing these proxy voting guidelines, MFS periodically reviews corporate governance issues and proxy voting matters that are presented for shareholder vote by either management or shareholders of public companies. Based on the overall principle that all votes cast by MFS on behalf of its clients must be in what MFS believes to be the best long-term economic interests of such clients, MFS has adopted proxy voting guidelines, set forth below, that govern how MFS generally will vote on specific matters presented for shareholder vote. In all cases, MFS will exercise its discretion in voting on these matters in accordance with this overall principle. In other words, the underlying guidelines are simply that guidelines. Proxy items of significance are often considered on a case-by-case basis, in light of all relevant facts and circumstances, and in certain cases MFS may vote proxies in a manner different from what otherwise would be dictated by these guidelines.

As a general matter, MFS maintains a consistent voting position on similar proxy proposals with respect to various issuers. In addition, MFS generally votes consistently on the same matter when securities of an issuer are held by multiple client accounts. However, MFS recognizes that there are gradations in certain types of proposals that might result in different voting positions being taken with respect to different proxy statements. There also may be situations involving matters presented for shareholder vote that are not governed by the guidelines or situations where MFS has received explicit voting instructions from a client for its own account. Some items that otherwise would be acceptable will be voted against the proponent when it is seeking extremely broad flexibility without offering a valid explanation. MFS reserves the right to override the guidelines with respect to a particular shareholder vote when such an override is, in MFS best judgment, consistent with the overall principle of voting proxies in the best long-term economic interests of MFS clients.

From time to time, MFS may receive comments on the MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures from its clients. These comments are carefully considered by MFS when it reviews these guidelines each year and revises them as appropriate.

These policies and procedures are intended to address any potential material conflicts of interest on the part of MFS or its subsidiaries that are likely to arise in connection with the voting of proxies on behalf of MFS clients. If such potential material conflicts of interest do arise, MFS will analyze, document and report on such potential material conflicts of interest (see Sections B.2 and E below), and shall ultimately vote the relevant proxies in what MFS believes to be the best long-term economic interests of its clients. The MFS Proxy Voting Committee is responsible for monitoring and reporting with respect to such potential material conflicts of interest.

Table of Contents

2. MFS Policy on Specific Issues

Election of Directors

MFS believes that good governance should be based on a board with at least a simple majority of directors who are independent of management, and whose key committees (e.g., compensation, nominating, and audit committees) are comprised entirely of independent directors. While MFS generally supports the board's nominees in uncontested elections, we will not support a nominee to a board of a U.S. issuer if, as a result of such nominee being elected to the board, the board would be comprised of a majority of members who are not independent or, alternatively, the compensation, nominating (including instances in which the full board serves as the nominating committee) or audit committees would include members who are not independent.

MFS will also not support a nominee to a board if we can determine that he or she failed to attend at least 75% of the board and/or relevant committee meetings in the previous year without a valid reason stated in the proxy materials. In addition, MFS will not support all nominees standing for re-election to a board if we can determine: (1) since the last annual meeting of shareholders and without shareholder approval, the board or its compensation committee has re-priced underwater stock options; or (2) since the last annual meeting, the board has either implemented a poison pill without shareholder approval or has not taken responsive action to a majority shareholder approved resolution recommending that the poison pill be rescinded. Responsive action would include the rescission of the poison pill (without a broad reservation to reinstate the poison pill in the event of a hostile tender offer), or assurance in the proxy materials that the terms of the poison pill would be put to a binding shareholder vote within the next five to seven years.

MFS will also not support a nominee (other than a nominee who serves as the issuer's Chief Executive Officer) standing for re-election if such nominee participated (as a director or committee member) in the approval of senior executive compensation that MFS deems to be excessive due to pay for performance issues and/or poor pay practices. In the event that MFS determines that an issuer has adopted excessive executive compensation, MFS may also not support the re-election of the issuer's Chief Executive Officer as director regardless of whether the Chief Executive Officer participated in the approval of the package. MFS will determine whether senior executive compensation is excessive on a case by case basis. Examples of poor pay practices include, but are not limited to, egregious employment contract terms or pension payouts, backdated stock options, overly generous hiring bonuses for chief executive officers, or excessive perks.

MFS evaluates a contested or contentious election of directors on a case-by-case basis considering the long-term financial performance of the company relative to its industry, management's track record, the qualifications of the nominees for both slates, if applicable, and an evaluation of what each side is offering shareholders.

Table of Contents

Majority Voting and Director Elections

MFS votes for reasonably crafted proposals calling for directors to be elected with an affirmative majority of votes cast and/or the elimination of the plurality standard for electing directors (including binding resolutions requesting that the board amend the company's bylaws), provided the proposal includes a carve-out for a plurality voting standard when there are more director nominees than board seats (e.g., contested elections) (Majority Vote Proposals). MFS considers voting against Majority Vote Proposals if the company has adopted, or has proposed to adopt in the proxy statement, formal corporate governance principles that present a meaningful alternative to the majority voting standard and provide an adequate response to both new nominees as well as incumbent nominees who fail to receive a majority of votes cast. MFS believes that a company's election policy should address the specific circumstances at that company. In determining whether the issuer has a meaningful alternative to the majority voting standard, MFS considers whether a company's election policy articulates the following elements to address each director nominee who fails to receive an affirmative majority of votes cast in an election:

Establish guidelines for the process by which the company determines the status of nominees who fail to receive an affirmative majority of votes cast and disclose the guidelines in the annual proxy statement;

Guidelines should include a reasonable timetable for resolution of the nominee's status and a requirement that the resolution be disclosed together with the reasons for the resolution;

Vest management of the process in the company's independent directors, other than the nominee in question; and

Outline the range of remedies that the independent directors may consider concerning the nominee.

Classified Boards

MFS opposes proposals to classify a board (e.g. a board in which only one-third of board members is elected each year). MFS supports proposals to declassify a board.

Non-Salary Compensation Programs

MFS votes against stock option programs for officers, employees or non-employee directors that do not require an investment by the optionee, that give free rides on the stock price, or that permit grants of stock options with an exercise price below fair market value on the date the options are granted.

MFS also opposes stock option programs that allow the board or the compensation committee, without shareholder approval, to reprice underwater options or to automatically replenish shares (i.e. evergreen plans). MFS will consider on a case-by-case basis proposals to exchange existing options for newly issued options (taking into account such factors as whether there is a reasonable value-for-value exchange).

Table of Contents

MFS opposes stock option programs and restricted stock plans that provide unduly generous compensation for officers, directors or employees, or could result in excessive dilution to other shareholders. As a general guideline, MFS votes against restricted stock plans, stock option, non-employee director, omnibus stock plans and any other stock plan if all such plans for a particular company involve potential dilution, in the aggregate, of more than 15%. However, MFS will also vote against stock plans that involve potential dilution, in aggregate, of more than 10% at U.S. issuers that are listed in the Standard and Poor's 100 index as of December 31 of the previous year.

Expensing of Stock Options

MFS supports shareholder proposals to expense stock options because we believe that the expensing of options presents a more accurate picture of the company's financial results to investors. We also believe that companies are likely to be more disciplined when granting options if the value of stock options were treated as an expense item on the company's income statements.

Executive Compensation

MFS believes that competitive compensation packages are necessary to attract, motivate and retain executives. Therefore, MFS opposes shareholder proposals that seek to set restrictions on executive compensation. We believe that the election of an issuer's compensation committee members is the appropriate mechanism to express our view on a company's compensation practices, as outlined above. MFS also opposes shareholder requests for disclosure on executive compensation beyond regulatory requirements because we believe that current regulatory requirements for disclosure of executive compensation are appropriate and that additional disclosure is often unwarranted and costly. Although we support linking executive stock option grants to a company's performance, MFS opposes shareholder proposals that mandate a link of performance-based options to a specific industry or peer group stock index. MFS believes that compensation committees should retain the flexibility to propose the appropriate index or other criteria by which performance-based options should be measured.

MFS will generally support management proposals on its executive compensation practices during the issuer's prior fiscal year. However, if MFS identifies excessive executive compensation practices during the issuer's prior fiscal year, then MFS will vote against such proposals.

MFS generally votes with management on shareholder proposals to include an annual advisory shareholder vote on the company's executive compensation practices in the issuer's proxy statement (Say on Pay). However, if MFS identifies excessive executive compensation practices at the issuer during the prior fiscal year, then MFS will support such Say on Pay shareholder proposals at those issuers. MFS also supports reasonably crafted shareholder proposals that (i) require the issuer to adopt a policy to recover the portion of performance-based bonuses and awards paid to senior executives

Table of Contents

that were not earned based upon a significant negative restatement of earnings unless the company already has adopted a clearly satisfactory policy on the matter, or (ii) expressly prohibit any future backdating of stock options.

Employee Stock Purchase Plans

MFS supports the use of a broad-based employee stock purchase plans to increase company stock ownership by employees, provided that shares purchased under the plan are acquired for no less than 85% of their market value and do not result in excessive dilution.

Golden Parachutes

From time to time, shareholders of companies have submitted proxy proposals that would require shareholder approval of severance packages for executive officers that exceed certain predetermined thresholds. MFS votes in favor of such shareholder proposals when they would require shareholder approval of any severance package for an executive officer that exceeds a certain multiple of such officer's annual compensation that is not determined in MFS' judgment to be excessive.

Anti-Takeover Measures

In general, MFS votes against any measure that inhibits capital appreciation in a stock, including proposals that protect management from action by shareholders. These types of proposals take many forms, ranging from poison pills and shark repellents to super-majority requirements.

MFS generally votes for proposals to rescind existing poison pills and proposals that would require shareholder approval to adopt prospective poison pills, unless the company already has adopted a clearly satisfactory policy on the matter. MFS may consider the adoption of a prospective poison pill or the continuation of an existing poison pill if we can determine that the following two conditions are met: (1) the poison pill allows MFS clients to hold an aggregate position of up to 15% of a company's total voting securities (and of any class of voting securities); and (2) either (a) the poison pill has a term of not longer than five years, provided that MFS will consider voting in favor of the poison pill if the term does not exceed seven years and the poison pill is linked to a business strategy or purpose that MFS believes is likely to result in greater value for shareholders; or (b) the terms of the poison pill allow MFS clients the opportunity to accept a fairly structured and attractively priced tender offer (e.g. a chewable poison pill that automatically dissolves in the event of an all cash, all shares tender offer at a premium price). MFS will also consider on a case-by-case basis proposals designed to prevent tenders which are disadvantageous to shareholders such as tenders at below market prices and tenders for substantially less than all shares of an issuer.

Table of Contents

Reincorporation and Reorganization Proposals

When presented with a proposal to reincorporate a company under the laws of a different state, or to effect some other type of corporate reorganization, MFS considers the underlying purpose and ultimate effect of such a proposal in determining whether or not to support such a measure. MFS generally votes with management in regards to these types of proposals, however, if MFS believes the proposal is in the best long-term economic interests of its clients, then MFS may vote against management (e.g. the intent or effect would be to create additional inappropriate impediments to possible acquisitions or takeovers).

Issuance of Stock

There are many legitimate reasons for the issuance of stock. Nevertheless, as noted above under Non-Salary Compensation Programs, when a stock option plan (either individually or when aggregated with other plans of the same company) would substantially dilute the existing equity (e.g. by approximately 10-15% as described above), MFS generally votes against the plan. In addition, MFS votes against proposals where management is asking for authorization to issue common or preferred stock with no reason stated (a blank check) because the unexplained authorization could work as a potential anti-takeover device. MFS may also vote against the authorization or issuance of common or preferred stock if MFS determines that the requested authorization is excessive and not warranted.

Repurchase Programs

MFS supports proposals to institute share repurchase plans in which all shareholders have the opportunity to participate on an equal basis. Such plans may include a company acquiring its own shares on the open market, or a company making a tender offer to its own shareholders.

Confidential Voting

MFS votes in favor of proposals to ensure that shareholder voting results are kept confidential. For example, MFS supports proposals that would prevent management from having access to shareholder voting information that is compiled by an independent proxy tabulation firm.

Cumulative Voting

MFS opposes proposals that seek to introduce cumulative voting and for proposals that seek to eliminate cumulative voting. In either case, MFS will consider whether cumulative voting is likely to enhance the interests of MFS clients as minority shareholders. In our view, shareholders should provide names of qualified candidates to a company's nominating committee, which, in our view, should be comprised solely of independent directors.

Table of Contents

Written Consent and Special Meetings

Because the shareholder right to act by written consent (without calling a formal meeting of shareholders) can be a powerful tool for shareholders, MFS generally opposes proposals that would prevent shareholders from taking action without a formal meeting or would take away a shareholder's right to call a special meeting of company shareholders pursuant to relevant state law.

Independent Auditors

MFS believes that the appointment of auditors for U.S. issuers is best left to the board of directors of the company and therefore supports the ratification of the board's selection of an auditor for the company. Some shareholder groups have submitted proposals to limit the non-audit activities of a company's audit firm or prohibit any non-audit services by a company's auditors to that company. MFS opposes proposals recommending the prohibition or limitation of the performance of non-audit services by an auditor, and proposals recommending the removal of a company's auditor due to the performance of non-audit work for the company by its auditor. MFS believes that the board, or its audit committee, should have the discretion to hire the company's auditor for specific pieces of non-audit work in the limited situations permitted under current law.

Other Environmental, Social and Governance Issues

There are many groups advocating social change or changes to corporate governance or corporate responsibility standards, and many have chosen the publicly-held corporation as a vehicle for advancing their agenda. Generally, MFS votes with management on such proposals unless MFS can clearly determine that the benefit to shareholders will outweigh any costs or disruptions to the business if the proposal were adopted. Common among the shareholder proposals that MFS generally votes with management are proposals requiring the company to use corporate resources to further a particular social objective outside the business of the company, to refrain from investing or conducting business in certain countries, to adhere to some list of goals or principles (e.g., environmental standards), to permit shareholders access to the company's proxy statement in connection with the election of directors, to disclose political contributions made by the issuer, to separate the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer positions, or to promulgate special reports on various activities or proposals for which no discernible shareholder economic advantage is evident.

The laws of various states or countries may regulate how the interests of certain clients subject to those laws (e.g. state pension plans) are voted with respect to social issues. Thus, it may be necessary to cast ballots differently for certain clients than MFS might normally do for other clients.

Table of Contents

Foreign Issuers

Many of the items on foreign proxies involve repetitive, non-controversial matters that are mandated by local law. Accordingly, the items that are generally deemed routine and which do not require the exercise of judgment under these guidelines (and therefore voted with management) for foreign issuers include, but are not limited to, the following: (i) receiving financial statements or other reports from the board; (ii) approval of declarations of dividends; (iii) appointment of shareholders to sign board meeting minutes; (iv) discharge of management and supervisory boards; and (v) approval of share repurchase programs.

MFS generally supports the election of a director nominee standing for re-election in uncontested elections unless it can be determined that (1) he or she failed to attend at least 75% of the board and/or relevant committee meetings in the previous year without a valid reason given in the proxy materials; (2) since the last annual meeting of shareholders and without shareholder approval, the board or its compensation committee has re-priced underwater stock options; or (3) since the last annual meeting, the board has either implemented a poison pill without shareholder approval or has not taken responsive action to a majority shareholder approved resolution recommending that the poison pill be rescinded. MFS will also not support a director nominee standing for re-election of an issuer that has adopted an excessive compensation package for its senior executives as described above in the section entitled *Voting Guidelines-MFS Policy on Specific Issues-Election of Directors*.

MFS generally supports the election of auditors, but may determine to vote against the election of a statutory auditor in certain markets if MFS reasonably believes that the statutory auditor is not truly independent. MFS will evaluate all other items on proxies for foreign companies in the context of the guidelines described above, but will generally vote against an item if there is not sufficient information disclosed in order to make an informed voting decision.

In accordance with local law or business practices, many foreign companies prevent the sales of shares that have been voted for a certain period beginning prior to the shareholder meeting and ending on the day following the meeting (share blocking). Depending on the country in which a company is domiciled, the blocking period may begin a stated number of days prior or subsequent to the meeting (e.g. one, three or five days) or on a date established by the company. While practices vary, in many countries the block period can be continued for a longer period if the shareholder meeting is adjourned and postponed to a later date. Similarly, practices vary widely as to the ability of a shareholder to have the block restriction lifted early (e.g. in some countries shares generally can be unblocked up to two days prior to the meeting whereas in other countries the removal of the block appears to be discretionary with the issuer's transfer agent). Due to these restrictions, MFS must balance the benefits to its clients of voting proxies against the potentially serious portfolio management consequences of a reduced flexibility to sell the underlying shares at the most advantageous time. For companies in countries with share blocking periods, the disadvantage of being unable to sell the stock regardless of changing conditions generally outweighs the advantages of voting at the shareholder meeting for routine items. Accordingly, MFS will not vote those proxies in the absence of an unusual, significant vote that outweighs the disadvantage of being unable to sell the stock.

Table of Contents

In limited circumstances, other market specific impediments to voting shares may limit our ability to cast votes, including, but not limited to, late delivery of proxy materials, power of attorney and share re-registration requirements, or any other unusual voting requirements. In these limited instances, MFS votes securities on a best efforts basis in the context of the guidelines described above.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

1. MFS Proxy Voting Committee

The administration of these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures is overseen by the MFS Proxy Voting Committee, which includes senior personnel from the MFS Legal and Global Investment Support Departments. The Proxy Voting Committee does not include individuals whose primary duties relate to client relationship management, marketing, or sales. The MFS Proxy Voting Committee:

- a. Reviews these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures at least annually and recommends any amendments considered to be necessary or advisable;
- b. Determines whether any potential material conflict of interest exist with respect to instances in which MFS (i) seeks to override these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures; (ii) votes on ballot items not governed by these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures; (iii) evaluates an excessive executive compensation issue in relation to the election of directors; or (iv) requests a vote recommendation from an MFS portfolio manager or investment analyst (e.g. mergers and acquisitions); and
- c. Considers special proxy issues as they may arise from time to time.

2. Potential Conflicts of Interest

The MFS Proxy Voting Committee is responsible for monitoring potential material conflicts of interest on the part of MFS or its subsidiaries that could arise in connection with the voting of proxies on behalf of MFS clients. Due to the client focus of our investment management business, we believe that the potential for actual material conflict of interest issues is small. Nonetheless, we have developed precautions to assure that all proxy votes are cast in the best long-term economic interest of shareholders. Other MFS internal policies require all MFS employees to avoid actual and potential conflicts of interests between personal activities and MFS client activities. If an employee identifies an actual or potential conflict of interest with respect to any voting decision, then that employee must recuse himself/herself from participating in the voting process.

Table of Contents

Additionally, with respect to decisions concerning all Non Standard Votes, as defined below, MFS will review the securities holdings reported by the individuals that participate in such decision to determine whether such person has a direct economic interest in the decision, in which case such person shall not further participate in making the decision. Any significant attempt by an employee of MFS or its subsidiaries to influence MFS voting on a particular proxy matter should also be reported to the MFS Proxy Voting Committee.

In cases where proxies are voted in accordance with these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures, no material conflict of interest will be deemed to exist. In cases where (i) MFS is considering overriding these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures, (ii) matters presented for vote are not clearly governed by these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures, (iii) MFS evaluates an excessive executive compensation issue in relation to the election of directors, or (iv) a vote recommendation is requested from an MFS portfolio manager or investment analyst (e.g. mergers and acquisitions) (collectively, Non Standard Votes); the MFS Proxy Voting Committee will follow these procedures:

- a. Compare the name of the issuer of such proxy against a list of significant current (i) distributors of MFS Fund shares, and (ii) MFS institutional clients (the MFS Significant Client List);
- b. If the name of the issuer does not appear on the MFS Significant Client List, then no material conflict of interest will be deemed to exist, and the proxy will be voted as otherwise determined by the MFS Proxy Voting Committee;
- c. If the name of the issuer appears on the MFS Significant Client List, then the MFS Proxy Voting Committee will be apprised of that fact and each member of the MFS Proxy Voting Committee will carefully evaluate the proposed vote in order to ensure that the proxy ultimately is voted in what MFS believes to be the best long-term economic interests of MFS clients, and not in MFS corporate interests; and
- d. For all potential material conflicts of interest identified under clause (c) above, the MFS Proxy Voting Committee will document: the name of the issuer, the issuer's relationship to MFS, the analysis of the matters submitted for proxy vote, the votes as to be cast and the reasons why the MFS Proxy Voting Committee determined that the votes were cast in the best long-term economic interests of MFS clients, and not in MFS corporate interests. A copy of the foregoing documentation will be provided to MFS Conflicts Officer.

The members of the MFS Proxy Voting Committee are responsible for creating and maintaining the MFS Significant Client List, in consultation with MFS distribution and institutional business units. The MFS Significant Client List will be reviewed and updated periodically, as appropriate.

Table of Contents

From time to time, certain MFS Funds (the top tier fund) may own shares of other MFS Funds (the underlying fund). If an underlying fund submits a matter to a shareholder vote, the top tier fund will generally vote its shares in the same proportion as the other shareholders of the underlying fund.

3. Gathering Proxies

Most U.S. proxies received by MFS and its clients originate at Automatic Data Processing Corp. (ADP) although a few proxies are transmitted to investors by corporate issuers through their custodians or depositories. ADP and other service providers, on behalf of issuers, send proxy related material to the record holders of the shares beneficially owned by MFS clients, usually to the client s proxy voting administrator or, less commonly, to the client itself. This material will include proxy ballots reflecting the shareholdings of Funds and of clients on the record dates for such shareholder meetings, as well as proxy statements with the issuer s explanation of the items to be voted upon.

MFS, on behalf of itself and the Funds, has entered into an agreement with an independent proxy administration firm, RiskMetrics Group, Inc., Inc. (the Proxy Administrator), pursuant to which the Proxy Administrator performs various proxy vote related administrative services, such as vote processing and recordkeeping functions for MFS Funds and institutional client accounts. The Proxy Administrator receives proxy statements and proxy ballots directly or indirectly from various custodians, logs these materials into its database and matches upcoming meetings with MFS Fund and client portfolio holdings, which are input into the Proxy Administrator s system by an MFS holdings datafeed. Through the use of the Proxy Administrator system, ballots and proxy material summaries for all upcoming shareholders meetings are available on-line to certain MFS employees and members of the MFS Proxy Voting Committee.

4. Analyzing Proxies

Proxies are voted in accordance with these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures. The Proxy Administrator, at the prior direction of MFS, automatically votes all proxy matters that do not require the particular exercise of discretion or judgment with respect to these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures as determined by the MFS Proxy Voting Committee. With respect to proxy matters that require the particular exercise of discretion or judgment, MFS considers and votes on those proxy matters. MFS also receives research from ISS which it may take into account in deciding how to vote. In addition, MFS expects to rely on ISS to identify circumstances in which a board may have approved excessive executive compensation. Representatives of the MFS Proxy Voting Committee review, as appropriate, votes cast to ensure conformity with these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures.

As a general matter, portfolio managers and investment analysts have little or no involvement in specific votes taken by MFS. This is designed to promote consistency in the application of MFS voting guidelines, to promote consistency in voting on the same or

Table of Contents

similar issues (for the same or for multiple issuers) across all client accounts, and to minimize the potential that proxy solicitors, issuers, or third parties might attempt to exert inappropriate influence on the vote. In limited types of votes (e.g., corporate actions, such as mergers and acquisitions), a representative of MFS Proxy Voting Committee may consult with or seek recommendations from MFS portfolio managers or investment analysts.¹ However, the MFS Proxy Voting Committee would ultimately determine the manner in which all proxies are voted.

As noted above, MFS reserves the right to override the guidelines when such an override is, in MFS' best judgment, consistent with the overall principle of voting proxies in the best long-term economic interests of MFS' clients. Any such override of the guidelines shall be analyzed, documented and reported in accordance with the procedures set forth in these policies.

5. Voting Proxies

In accordance with its contract with MFS, the Proxy Administrator also generates a variety of reports for the MFS Proxy Voting Committee, and makes available on-line various other types of information so that the MFS Proxy Voting Committee may review and monitor the votes cast by the Proxy Administrator on behalf of MFS' clients.

6. Securities Lending

From time to time, the MFS Funds or other pooled investment vehicles sponsored by MFS may participate in a securities lending program. In the event MFS or its agent receives timely notice of a shareholder meeting for a U.S. security, MFS and its agent will attempt to recall any securities on loan before the meeting's record date so that MFS will be entitled to vote these shares. However, there may be instances in which MFS is unable to timely recall securities on loan for a U.S. security, in which cases MFS will not be able to vote these shares. MFS will report to the appropriate board of the MFS Funds those instances in which MFS is not able to timely recall the loaned securities. MFS generally does not recall non-U.S. securities on loan because there is generally insufficient advance notice of record or vote cut-off dates to allow MFS to timely recall the shares. As a result, non-U.S. securities that are on loan will not generally be voted. If MFS receives timely notice of what MFS determines to be an unusual, significant vote for a non-U.S. security whereas MFS shares are on loan, and determines that voting is in the best long-term economic interest of shareholders, then MFS will attempt to timely recall the loaned shares.

¹ From time to time, due to travel schedules and other commitments, an appropriate portfolio manager or research analyst is not available to provide a recommendation on a merger or acquisition proposal. If such a recommendation cannot be obtained prior to the cut-off date of the shareholder meeting, certain members of the MFS Proxy Voting Committee may determine to abstain from voting.

Table of Contents

C. MONITORING SYSTEM

It is the responsibility of the Proxy Administrator and MFS Proxy Voting Committee to monitor the proxy voting process. When proxy materials for clients are received by the Proxy Administrator, they are input into the Proxy Administrator's system. Through an interface with the portfolio holdings database of MFS, the Proxy Administrator matches a list of all MFS Funds and clients who hold shares of a company's stock and the number of shares held on the record date with the Proxy Administrator's listing of any upcoming shareholder's meeting of that company.

When the Proxy Administrator's system tickler shows that the voting cut-off date of a shareholder's meeting is approaching, a Proxy Administrator representative checks that the vote for MFS Funds and clients holding that security has been recorded in the computer system. If a proxy ballot has not been received from the client's custodian, the Proxy Administrator contacts the custodian requesting that the materials be forwarded immediately. If it is not possible to receive the proxy ballot from the custodian in time to be voted at the meeting, then MFS may instruct the custodian to cast the vote in the manner specified and to mail the proxy directly to the issuer.

D. RECORDS RETENTION

MFS will retain copies of these MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures in effect from time to time and will retain all proxy voting reports submitted to the Board of Trustees and Board of Managers of the MFS Funds for the period required by applicable law. Proxy solicitation materials, including electronic versions of the proxy ballots completed by representatives of the MFS Proxy Voting Committee, together with their respective notes and comments, are maintained in an electronic format by the Proxy Administrator and are accessible on-line by the MFS Proxy Voting Committee. All proxy voting materials and supporting documentation, including records generated by the Proxy Administrator's system as to proxies processed, including the dates when proxy ballots were received and submitted, and the votes on each company's proxy issues, are retained as required by applicable law.

E. REPORTS

MFS Funds

MFS publicly discloses the proxy voting records of the MFS Funds on an annual basis, as required by law. MFS will also report the results of its voting to the Board of Trustees and Board of Managers of the MFS Funds. These reports will include: (i) a summary of how votes were cast; (ii) a summary of votes against management's recommendation; (iii) a review of situations where MFS did not vote in accordance with the guidelines and the rationale therefore; (iv) a review of the procedures used by MFS to identify material conflicts of interest and any matters identified as a material conflict of interest; (v) a review of these policies and the guidelines, (vi) a report and impact

Table of Contents

assessment of instances in which the recall of loaned securities of a U.S. issuer was unsuccessful, and, as necessary or appropriate, any proposed modifications thereto to reflect new developments in corporate governance and other issues. Based on these reviews, the Trustees and Managers of the MFS Funds will consider possible modifications to these policies to the extent necessary or advisable.

All MFS Advisory Clients

At any time, a report can be printed by MFS for each client who has requested that MFS furnish a record of votes cast. The report specifies the proxy issues which have been voted for the client during the year and the position taken with respect to each issue and, upon request, may identify situations where MFS did not vote in accordance with the MFS Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures.

Except as described above, MFS generally will not divulge actual voting practices to any party other than the client or its representatives (unless required by applicable law) because we consider that information to be confidential and proprietary to the client.

ITEM 8. PORTFOLIO MANAGERS OF CLOSED-END MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

General. Information regarding the portfolio manager(s) of the MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust (the Fund) is set forth below.

Portfolio Manager	Primary Role	Since	Title and Five Year History
Michael L. Dawson	Portfolio Manager	2007	Investment Officer of MFS; employed in the investment area of MFS since 1998.
Geoffrey L. Schechter	Portfolio Manager	2007	Investment Officer of MFS; employed in the investment area of MFS since 1993.

Compensation. Portfolio manager total cash compensation is a combination of base salary and performance bonus:

Base Salary Base salary represents a smaller percentage of portfolio manager total cash compensation (generally below 10%) than performance bonus.

Performance Bonus Generally, the performance bonus represents a majority of portfolio manager total cash compensation.

Table of Contents

The performance bonus is based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative factors, with more weight given to the former (generally over 60%) and less weight given to the latter.

The quantitative portion is based on pre-tax performance of assets managed by the portfolio manager over one-, three- and five-year periods relative to peer group universes and/or indices (benchmarks). As of December 31, 2007, the following benchmarks were used:

Portfolio Manager	Benchmark(s)
Michael L. Dawson	Lipper Alabama Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds Lipper California Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Florida Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Georgia Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Massachusetts Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Maryland Municipal Debt Funds Lipper North Carolina Municipal Debt Funds Lipper New York Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Pennsylvania Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Tennessee Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Virginia Municipal Debt Funds Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index
Geoffrey L. Schechter	Lipper General Municipal Debt Funds Lipper Short-Intermediate Municipal Debt Funds Lipper High Yield Municipal Debt Funds Lipper General US Government Funds Barclays Capital Municipal Index Barclays Capital Government Mortgage Index Morningstar Dollar Government Bond Funds

Additional or different benchmarks, including versions of indices and custom indices may also be used. Primary weight is given to portfolio performance over a three-year time period with lesser consideration given to portfolio performance over one-year and five-year periods (adjusted as appropriate if the portfolio manager has served for less than five years).

The qualitative portion is based on the results of an annual internal peer review process (conducted by other portfolio managers, analysts and traders) and management's assessment of overall portfolio manager contributions to investor relations and the investment process (distinct from fund and other account performance).

Portfolio managers also typically benefit from the opportunity to participate in the MFS Equity Plan. Equity interests and/or options to acquire equity interests in MFS or its parent company are awarded by management, on a discretionary basis, taking into account tenure at MFS, contribution to the investment process, and other factors.

Table of Contents

Finally, portfolio managers are provided with a benefits package including a defined contribution plan, health coverage and other insurance, which are available to other employees of MFS on substantially similar terms. The percentage such benefits represent of any portfolio manager's compensation depends upon the length of the individual's tenure at MFS and salary level, as well as other factors.

Ownership of Fund Shares. The following table shows the dollar range of equity securities of the Fund beneficially owned by the Fund's portfolio manager(s) as of the fund's fiscal year ended November 30, 2008. The following dollar ranges apply:

- N. None
- A. \$1 - \$10,000
- B. \$10,001 - \$50,000
- C. \$50,001 - \$100,000
- D. \$100,001 - \$500,000
- E. \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- F. Over \$1,000,000

Name of Portfolio Manager	Dollar Range of Equity Securities in Fund
Michael L. Dawson	N
Geoffrey L. Schechter	N

Other Accounts. In addition to the Fund, the Fund's portfolio manager is responsible (either individually or jointly) for the day-to-day management of certain other accounts, the number and assets of which, as of the Fund's fiscal year ended November 30, 2008 were as follows:

Name	Registered Investment Companies		Other Pooled Investment Vehicles		Other Accounts	
	Number of Accounts*	Total Assets*	Number of Accounts	Total Assets	Number of Accounts	Total Assets
Michael L. Dawson	17	\$2.5 billion	0	N/A	0	N/A
Geoffrey L. Schechter	13	\$6.0 billion	1	\$443.4 million	0	N/A

* Includes the Fund.

Advisory fees are not based upon performance of any of the accounts identified in the table above.

Table of Contents**Potential Conflicts of Interest.**

The Adviser seeks to identify potential conflicts of interest resulting from a portfolio manager's management of both the Fund and other accounts, and has adopted policies and procedures designed to address such potential conflicts.

The management of multiple funds and accounts (including proprietary accounts) may give rise to potential conflicts of interest if the funds and accounts have different objectives and strategies, benchmarks, time horizons and fees as a portfolio manager must allocate his or her time and investment ideas across multiple funds and accounts. In certain instances there are securities which are suitable for the Fund's portfolio as well as for accounts of the Adviser or its subsidiaries with similar investment objectives. A Fund's trade allocation policies may give rise to conflicts of interest if the Fund's orders do not get fully executed or are delayed in getting executed due to being aggregated with those of other accounts of the Adviser or its subsidiaries. A portfolio manager may execute transactions for another fund or account that may adversely impact the value of the Fund's investments. Investments selected for funds or accounts other than the Fund may outperform investments selected for the Fund.

When two or more clients are simultaneously engaged in the purchase or sale of the same security, the securities are allocated among clients in a manner believed by the Adviser to be fair and equitable to each. It is recognized that in some cases this system could have a detrimental effect on the price or volume of the security as far as the Fund is concerned. In most cases, however, the Adviser believes that the Fund's ability to participate in volume transactions will produce better executions for the Fund.

The Adviser and/or a portfolio manager may have a financial incentive to allocate favorable or limited opportunity investments or structure the timing of investments to favor accounts other than the Fund, for instance, those that pay a higher advisory fee and/or have a performance adjustment.

ITEM 9. PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES BY CLOSED-END MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANY AND AFFILIATED PURCHASERS.**MFS Investment Grade Municipal Trust**

Period	(a) Total number of Shares Purchased	(b) Average Price Paid per Share	(c) Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs	(d) Maximum Number (or Approximate Dollar Value) of Shares that May Yet Be Purchased under the Plans or Programs
12/1/07-12/31/07	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
1/1/08-1/31/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
2/1/08-2/29/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
3/1/08-3/31/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
4/1/08-4/30/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
5/1/08-5/31/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
6/1/08-6/30/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
7/1/08-7/31/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
8/1/08-8/31/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
9/1/08-9/30/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
10/01/08-10/31/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
11/01/08-11/30/08	0	N/A	0	1,150,900
Total	0		0	

Table of Contents

Note: The Board of Trustees approves procedures to repurchase shares annually. The notification to shareholders of the program is part of the semi-annual and annual reports sent to shareholders. These annual programs begin on March 1st of each year. The programs conform to the conditions of Rule 10b-18 of the securities Exchange Act of 1934 and limit the aggregate number of shares that may be purchased in each annual period (March 1 through the following February 28) to 10% of the Registrant's outstanding shares as of the first day of the plan year (March 1). The aggregate number of shares available for purchase for the March 1, 2008 plan year is 1,150,900.

ITEM 10. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS.

There were no material changes to the procedures by which shareholders may send recommendations to the Board for nominees to the Registrant's Board since the Registrant last provided disclosure as to such procedures in response to the requirements of Item 407 (c)(2)(iv) of Regulation S-K or this Item.

ITEM 11. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES.

- (a) Based upon their evaluation of the registrant's disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rule 30a-3(c) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the Act)) as conducted within 90 days of the filing date of this Form N-CSR, the registrant's principal financial officer and principal executive officer have concluded that those disclosure controls and procedures provide reasonable assurance that the material information required to be disclosed by the registrant on this report is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the Securities and Exchange Commission's rules and forms.
- (b) There were no changes in the registrant's internal controls over financial reporting (as defined in Rule 30a-3(d) under the Act) that occurred during the second fiscal quarter covered by the report that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the registrant's internal control over financial reporting.

Table of Contents

ITEM 12. EXHIBITS.

- (a) File the exhibits listed below as part of this form. Letter or number the exhibits in the sequence indicated.
- (1) Any code of ethics, or amendment thereto, that is the subject of the disclosure required by Item 2, to the extent that the registrant intends to satisfy the Item 2 requirements through filing of an exhibit: Code of Ethics attached hereto.
 - (2) A separate certification for each principal executive officer and principal financial officer of the registrant as required by Rule 30a-2 under the Act (17 CFR 270.30a-2): Attached hereto.
 - (3) Any written solicitation to purchase securities under Rule 23c-1 under the Act sent or given during the period covered by the report by or on behalf of the Registrant to 10 or more persons. Not applicable.
- (b) If the report is filed under Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, provide the certifications required by Rule 30a-2(b) under the Act (17 CFR 270.30a-2(b)), Rule 13a-14(b) or Rule 15d-14(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13a-14(b) or 240.15d-14(b)) and Section 1350 of Chapter 63 of Title 18 of the United States Code (18 U.S.C. 1350) as an exhibit. A certification furnished pursuant to this paragraph will not be deemed filed for the purposes of Section 18 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. 78r), or otherwise subject to the liability of that section. Such certification will not be deemed to be incorporated by reference into any filing under the Securities Act of 1933 or the Exchange Act, except to the extent that the registrant specifically incorporates it by reference: Attached hereto.

Table of Contents

Notice

A copy of the Agreement and Declaration of Trust, as amended, of the Registrant is on file with the Secretary of State of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and notice is hereby given that this instrument is executed on behalf of the Registrant by an officer of the Registrant as an officer and not individually and the obligations of or arising out of this instrument are not binding upon any of the Trustees or shareholders individually, but are binding only upon the assets and property of the respective constituent series of the Registrant.

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Registrant MFS INVESTMENT GRADE MUNICIPAL TRUST

By (Signature and Title)* MARIA F. DWYER
Maria F. Dwyer, President

Date: January 15, 2009

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

By (Signature and Title)* MARIA F. DWYER
Maria F. Dwyer, President
(Principal Executive Officer)

Date: January 15, 2009

By (Signature and Title)* JOHN M. CORCORAN
John M. Corcoran, Treasurer
(Principal Financial Officer
and Accounting Officer)

Date: January 15, 2009

* Print name and title of each signing officer under his or her signature.